PATTERNS OF IDENTIFICATION:

THE CHILDREN OF LATINO/NON-LATINO WHITE FAMILIES

A Thesis

by

AMBER RAQUEL FOX

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

December 2010

Major Subject: Sociology

PATTERNS OF IDENTIFICATION:

THE CHILDREN OF LATINO/NON-LATINO WHITE FAMILIES

A Thesis

by

AMBER RAQUEL FOX

Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of
Texas A&M University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Approved by:

Chair of Committee,	Rogelio Saenz
Committee Members,	Mark Fossett
	Marco Portales
Head of Department,	Mark Fossett

December 2010

Major Subject: Sociology

ABSTRACT

Patterns of Identification: The Children of Latino/Non-Latino White Families.

(December 2010)

Amber Raquel Fox, B.A., Texas A&M University – Commerce

Chair of Advisory Committee: Dr. Rogelio Saenz

This thesis examines the various factors that influence how children in Latino/non-Latino white households are racially and ethnically identified. The question of multiracial/ethnic identity has come to prominence following the changes made to the U.S. Census questionnaire beginning with the 2000 survey which allows the option of more than one racial identifier. However, little research has focused a group which must still grapple with the complications of identification, namely Latino/non-Latino families. Latino identity is considered to be an ethnic identification rather than a racial identification, with ethnic identification still allowing only one option on the census survey. Thus, these families still must struggle with the decision as to how to identify their children.

In this study, I use the 2005-2007 3-year sample of the American Community Survey to examine how various family dynamics and contextual factors can help to explain what drives the decisions of parents on how to racially and ethnically identify their children. Specifically, I use both multinomial logistic regression and multilevel binomial logistic regression to predict the outcome of the child either being identified as

Latino (white or other) or non-Latino (white or other). These models incorporate characteristics of the Latino parent and the non-Latino parent as well as the ethnic composition of the area in which the family lives.

The findings of this study indicate that certain characteristics of the Latino parent are most influential in determining how the child is identified. The language that the Latino parent speaks in the home, the nativity status of the Latino parent, and the ethnic origin group of the Latino parent are all important factors which influence the decision behind how to identify the children in the family. If the Latino parent speaks Spanish in the home, is Mexican in comparison to other Latino groups, and is U.S.-born, the child is more likely to be identified as Latino. However, influencing factors behind multiracial/ethnic identity go beyond the household. The percent Latino in the area in which the family lives also leads to a Latino identification for the child.

To Zach

For all of your love, support and patience.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair, Dr. Rogelio Saenz, and my committee members, Dr. Mark Fossett and Dr. Marco Portales, for their constant and helpful guidance and support throughout my research.

I would also like to thank my parents, my grandmother, my siblings and all of my family for guiding me to this point and supporting me along the way.

Thanks as well to the Crowell and Plunkett families for caring for me as one of their own and providing so much encouragement.

Thanks to all of my loved ones and friends who have been with me and supported me through my research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT iii

DEDICATION v

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS vi

TABLE OF CONTENTS vii

LIST OF TABLES ix

CHAPTER

I INTRODUCTION 1

II LITERATURE AND THEORY 8

Background 8
Micro Level Factors 15
Macro Level Factors 23
Micro Level Hypotheses 25
Macro Level Hypotheses 26

III DATA AND METHODOLOGY 27

Data Source 27
Sample Selection 27
Dependent Variable 29
Independent Variables 31
Methods 36

IV ANALYSIS 44

Overview 44
Descriptive Statistics 45
Model 1 50
Model 2 60
Summary 64

CHAPTER Page

V CONCLUSIONS 66

Findings 66
Implications 69
Limitations 72
Future Research 75

REFERENCES 77

VITA 82

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1 Dependent Variables 31

Table 2 Level-1 Independent Variables for Models 1 & 2 34

Table 3 Level-2 Independent Variable for Models 1 & 2 35

Table 4 Intraclass Correlation: One-Way ANOVA for Models 1 & 2 38

Table 5 Descriptive Statistics for Model 1, Latino Parents 49

Table 6 Descriptive Statistics for Model 2, White Parents 49

Table 7 Descriptive Statistics for Models 1 & 2, Child Characteristics 50

Table 8 Descriptive Statistics for Child Ethnicity, Polytomous 51

Table 9 Descriptive Statistics for Child Ethnicity by Latino Parent Ethnic Group 52

Table 10 Multinomial Results for Child Ethnicity, Latino Parents 55

Table 11 Multilevel Binomial Results for Child Ethnicity, Latino Parents 58

Table 12 Multinomial Results for Child Ethnicity, White Parents 61

Table 13 Multilevel Binomial Results for Child Ethnicity, White Parents 64

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Race and ethnicity continues to be one of the most important concerns in the field of sociology and related social sciences. Society continues to be influenced and in many ways guided by issues concerning race and ethnicity in nearly all spheres of interaction from politics to intimate relationships. But how do we separate people into racial and ethnic groups, what criteria do we use and who exactly is it that makes these decisions? In other words, how do we approach the concept of racial and ethnic identity? These are not easy questions for anybody, neither for researchers nor for people who find that they must categorize themselves and others into groups that have no clear boundaries.

Feagin and Feagin (2003:376) define a racial group as "a social group that persons inside or outside the group have decided is important to single out as inferior or superior, typically on the basis of real or alleged physical characteristics subjectively selected." One thing that can be taken from this definition is that race is socially constructed, an important concept to acknowledge because as a social construct, race is neither consistent across space and time nor does it follow any sort of reliable guidelines.

This thesis follows the style of *American Sociological Review*.

Feagin and Feagin (2003:374) define an ethnic group as "a group socially distinguished or set apart, by others or by itself, primarily on the basis of cultural or national-origin characteristics."

Yet even these generally agreed upon definitions fail to capture the complexity of race and ethnicity. The issue at hand in this study is how to go about identifying multiracial/ethnic individuals. Race and ethnicity are fluid concepts which change constantly and can depend on a large variety of factors. Multiracial/ethnic individuals whose parents are of different races and/or ethnicities must make a choice for themselves while at the same time being faced with how others perceive them.

The literature on multiracial/ethnic identity is extensive and continues to grow as the issue itself becomes more important. Racial boundaries are not as stringent as they once were and interracial relationships are encountering higher levels of acceptance in U.S. society (Farley, 2002). Researchers who study multiracial/ethnic identity have done much already to attempt to describe and explain what will come of this era of increasing racial and ethnic tolerance and how we should approach concepts of race and ethnicity in lieu of our growing multiracial/ethnic population (Bratter and Heard 2009; Edmonston, Lee, and Passel 2002, Harris 2002; Hochschild 2002).

Take for instance the case of black-white individuals who have one black parent and one white parent. Amidst the persisting "one-drop rule" in U.S. society which holds that individuals who are partially black and who appear black must therefore be identified as black, these individuals may choose to say that they are black, multiracial, or white. However, they are at the same time faced with strangers perceiving them as

merely black or possibly mixed depending on physical features (Campbell 2006). Rarely, however, will these individuals be perceived as white. This is an example of how black-white multiracial individuals, a group most prominently featured in multiracial/ethnic studies, are confronted with the complications of racial identity.

This study, however, concerns a more complex group of people. The children of Latino/non-Latino white couples are members of a complicated and not easily definable group. Latinos alone represent an extremely diverse group, containing members of many nationalities and a full spectrum of skin colors. These children deserve more attention in the wake of the current social and political issues regarding Latinos in the United States. Latinos as a whole are becoming one of the most important minority groups today in light of the political turmoil surrounding cultural and immigration debates and their rapid population growth. Some of the questions which we hear most are whether Latinos are "assimilating" into American society and whether or not it is acceptable for Latinos to maintain their respective cultures, including language, national loyalties, and identity. With regard to the question of identity, the Census serves as a good example. For the race question, Latinos must select from a limited set of options which are confusing because none of the options directly address what it means to be Latino. Some settle by indicating that they are "white" even though Latinos are racialized in a way that non-Latino whites are not and some decide to say "other" and must write in what they would like to be categorized as.

Compound this with being a multiracial/ethnic individual who is part Latino and part non-Latino white, and we find ourselves with a group of individuals who vary

across the board on how they identify themselves and how others, including their parents, identify them. What drives these choices, and should we perhaps reshape the way that we handle racial and ethnic identity? Just by examining how single-race Latinos identify themselves we know that it is not so simple to lump individuals into a select assortment of categories, especially since the Latino group itself is not at all a homogenous group. It is important that we have an understanding of what it means to choose one option over another.

This thesis aims to provide an understanding of what influences the racial and ethnic identification choices for Latino/non-Latino white individuals, specifically concerning the options provided on the U.S. Census questionnaire (American Community Survey). Multiracial/ethnic individuals are notably a growing population with a flexible understanding of what racial and ethnic identity means (Shih and Sanchez 2009). Officially, on the Census being Latino is an ethnic identification rather than a racial identification. Latino/non-Latino whites must therefore identify as Latino for their ethnicity and are then given a separate set of options for their race, i.e. white, black, etc. This places Latinos in the same racial categories as non-Latinos, although their ethnicity distinguishes them from non-Latinos. The question that this can raise for the children of Latino/non-Latino white couples is how they are identified when technically they are not racially mixed if both of their parents racially identify as white.

This group can be expected to grow into prominence due to the presence of Latino/non-Latino white intermarriages, especially so with native-born Latinos (Saenz 2004). For instance, among the Mexican U.S.-born population, the percentage of

intermarried Mexican men increased from 25.4 percent in 1990 to 27.8 percent in 2000, and the percentage of intermarried Mexican women increased from 25.7 percent in 1990 to 30.4 percent in 2000. Although more recent data shows that the rate of intermarriage has leveled off and even begun to decrease (Lichter, Brown, Qian, and Carmalt 2007; Saenz 2004), the significant number of intermarriages at the moment still implies that there is also a significant number of offspring from these unions. In particular, the largest Latino/non-Latino group are those who come from Latino/non-Latino white unions (Lee and Bean 2004). In 2000, an estimated 2.4 percent of the population identified as multiracial. The speculation is that the majority of individuals identified as multiracial in the future will be of Latino origin (Smith and Edmonston 1997).

What makes this population of Latino/non-Latino white individuals unique is the presence of foreign-born individuals within the Latino population. Though foreign-born Latino intermarriage is not as common, their prevalence in the overall Latino population has implications for the culture and interactions that Latinos and those who are associated with Latinos through marriage experience. Of the approximately 35.3 million Latinos in the United States in 2000, about 40 percent of them indicated that they were foreign-born according to the 2000 Census. Because of the important role of Latino immigration in the daily interactions that the Latino population has with the rest of the U.S. population, it is crucial to examine various factors related to immigration and integration into U.S. society.

What racial identity means to this portion of the population requires further investigation, especially when we consider the significant variation in identification that

already exists for single-race Latinos. In 2000, 48 percent of single-race Latinos identified as white and 42 percent identified as some other race, implying that identification for Latinos is fragmented within the group (Grieco and Cassidy 2001). When we look at multiracial/ethnic individuals, we can only expect identification to be even further complicated, especially in the case of those with Latino heritage since they are also confronted with the Latino ethnicity question.

This study has several purposes, the first of which is to expand our understanding of how individuals in U.S. society are currently handling the question of multiracial/ethnic identity. As social scientists, our first priority is to understand the behavior and attitudes of our subjects. From this we may go on to the next step, which is to describe, explain, and make implications and possibly suggestions for the future. Knowing how Latino/non-Latino families approach the racial/ethnic identification of their children can help us understand how families experience and define race and ethnicity when faced with deciding how their multiracial/ethnic children ought to be identified. Due to the limitations of the data, we cannot get direct answers as to how Latino/non-Latino whites go about choosing their own identities, but how their parents decide can provide just as much insight into the dynamics of a multiracial/ethnic family.

The second purpose of this study is to bring attention to a group which is often neglected within the multiracial/ethnic literature, even though Latinos as a group are increasingly being racialized and pulled under the spotlight, especially with regard to immigration issues and white attitudes. It is possible that the experiences of the individuals who result from intimate unions between Latinos and non-Latino whites may

provide us a perspective on how context shapes and influences identity, context referring to not only the political and social climate, but also everyday interactions which subtly affect the perceptions of individuals within various social spheres from the intimate to the most impersonal.

The first chapter of this thesis provides an introduction with a brief overview of the background and purposes that drive this study. The second chapter reviews the existing literature in great detail, beginning with the history of racial and ethnic identity in the United States, which emphasizes both its fluidity and its vulnerability to changing social and political contexts. The chapter then goes on to present literature specifically directed at explaining multiracial/ethnic identity. The third chapter describes the data and methods used for the analyses in this study. The fourth chapter presents and discusses the findings of the analyses. Lastly, the fifth chapter reviews and summarizes the findings, followed by a brief discussion of what can be taken away from this study and what direction this field of research should take from this point.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE AND THEORY

Background

The concept of racial and ethnic identity is one that has grown to prominence in recent years, especially after the alterations made to the U.S. Census in 1997 (Brunsma 2005; Farley 2002). Researchers have studied multiracial/ethnic identity from many different angles, much of it based on the effects of contextual factors such as socioeconomic status, group interactions, and parental involvement (Bratter and Heard 2009; González, Umaña-Taylor, and Bámaca 2006; Harris 2002; Holloway, Wright, Ellis, and East 2009). The most widely popular and accepted conception of racial/ethnic identity is that it is socially contrived, situational and constantly changing (Jacobson 2002; Massey and Denton 1992; Nagel 1994; Spickard 1992; Waters 1990). A look at the history of racial/ethnic identity extending back to the first U.S. Census confirms this as we see labels and numbers change according to the social context of the era in question (Bonilla-Silva 2004; Brunsma 2005; Campbell 2006; Holloway et al. 2009; Nagel 1994; Shih and Sanchez 2009). The evolution of racial identity is even further influenced by changes in immigration trends. The European immigrants of the early 20th century exemplify this pattern and serve as the basis for Milton Gordon's assimilation theory (Gordon 1964). These groups went from being ethnic minorities to identifying themselves as white over a period of two or three generations.

Today's largest immigrant populations, Latinos and Asians, bring up questions about how the dynamics of racial/ethnic identity are changing now in relation to these two groups (Edmonston et al. 2002; Lee and Bean 2007; Lee and Edmonston 2006; Thornton 1992; Saenz, Hwang, Aguirre, and Anderson 1995; Xie and Goyette 1997). These studies have in turn revealed that the dynamics of racial and ethnic identity vary across groups, especially when comparing black-white individuals to Latino- and Asian-white individuals (Bonilla-Silva 2004; Qian 2004), justifying the need to focus on one particular group in this study. Because we know that racial identity is a fluid concept, it is important to keep track of the patterns and trends of the current era. As can be seen in the literature, many factors influence the identification of multiracial/ethnic individuals. The history of multiracial/ethnic identity and the factors that are important to this particular study are discussed below.

Racial Identity on the U.S. Census

The first population count in the United States, enacted in 1790, made very minimal racial distinctions, only categorizing individuals by whether they were free whites, other freed persons, or slaves (Anderson 2002). At the time only whites were given a racial distinction and the question primarily existed as a way to identify slaves. This early form of categorization began the long history of legally racially classifying individuals in the United States (Anderson 2002). In 1849, the Census Board was created, and with it came changes to the way that the United States had been counting the population. Along with ordering that the census be administered on an individual level rather than a household level, the Board also altered how the census handled race.

For free individuals, they were placed into one of three categories – white, black, or mulatto. Slaves were placed into one of two categories – black or mulatto (Anderson 2002). According to Anderson (2002), it became important to identify mulattos as well based on "scientific" theories at the time which stated that, as whites and blacks were not even of the same species, mulattos, who were the offspring of white-black unions, were by their very genetic makeup biologically inferior to both groups (Farley 2002). The mulatto option was then available on the census until 1920 (Nobles 2000). The census of 1890 also included options for "octoroons" and "quadroons" (Glazer 2002).

In 1967, the *Loving v. Virginia* Supreme Court case opened up new doors to the handling of race and ethnicity in the United States. The case involved the arrest of a married couple, Richard Loving, a white man, and Mildred Loving, a black woman, who resided in the state of Virginia which was one of 16 states at the time where interracial marriage was outlawed. The Supreme Court ruled that laws which banned interracial marriages were unconstitutional, allowing finally for interracial couples to get married without legal persecution (Wadlington 1966). With the rise in interracial marriages following the ruling, we can safely say that there was also a rise in the multiracial/ethnic population, to the point that they now make up a significant portion of the population (Lee and Bean 2007; Shih and Sanchez 2009). Telles and Ortiz (2008) note that from the 1950s to 1980, there was a steady rise in intermarriage between Latinos and non-Latino whites, specifically referring to Mexican Americans who are the largest Latino population.

However, from 1977 up until the most recent changes applied to the 2000 census, the census only allowed single race options. The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) mandated only four racial categories – white, black, Asian/Pacific Islander, and American Indian/Alaskan native – and a separate question addressed Hispanic/Latino origin (Farley 2002). In 1988, the OMB did attempt to propose to add an "other" option to the race question in order to address the growing diversity of the population. Although the proposal was supported by many in the multiracial/ethnic community, several other agencies including the Civil Rights division of the Department of Justice opposed the idea (Office of Management and Budget 1994). Many civil rights organizations and groups were concerned that the addition of a multiracial category would detract from the minority population, although multiracial/ethnic individuals were in support of being recognized (Bratter 2000; Farley 2002). It was in 1994 that the OMB began to review the race and ethnicity categories and requested comments on their proposed revisions, one of which was the addition of a "multiracial" option and another being the addition of an "other" option (Office of Management and Budget 1994).

After receiving the comments and criticisms from different groups and organizations, in 1997 the OMB announced new guidelines with regards to the options available to respondents on the race question in the upcoming 2000 Census. The guideline which resulted from the debate and which also sparked a flare of interest in multiracial identity research was the one which directed that respondents be allowed to choose more than one racial identifier (Office of Management and Budget 1997). Despite the original suggestion to add a "multiracial" category and the social movement

which supported this suggestion, in the end they decided to instead allow individuals to pick as many racial identifiers as they wanted and the "multiracial" category was rejected. Although the OMB ultimately decided against the "multiracial" option, they were still successfully convinced that the race categories needed to be revised in order to capture a growing population of multiracial individuals in the nation (Farley 2002).

The results of the 2000 census revealed that an estimated 2.4 percent of the total U.S. population selected more than one racial category. Farley (2002) points out, however, that about one third of those individuals selected one race such as "white" or "black" and then also selected "other" and wrote in a Hispanic/Latino origin for their second race. If they are excluded on the basis that they are actually monoracial, only an estimated 1.6 percent indicated that they were multiracial. The issue that must be raised here is that many Latinos feel that they ought to write in a Hispanic/Latino origin because to them, it is their race and none of the other racial identifiers seem appropriate. It is worth noting that one of the OMB's suggested revisions was to make Hispanic a racial category (Office of Management and Budget 1994). However, thus far that change has not been made and Hispanic/Latino origin continues to be considered an ethnicity, not a race (Hollinger 2006).

With regards to the Hispanic/Latino origin question, though the OMB addressed the issue that it is still a single response question, no action was taken to change that. The OMB's primary concern at the time was to improve response rates and allowing more than one response was not expected to have made any major improvements. The question was revised, however, to say "Spanish/Hispanic/Latino" rather than the

previous "Spanish/Hispanic" in order to address parts of the country where the term "Latino" is preferred (Office of Management and Budget 1994). And although Latinos/non-Latinos cannot explicitly acknowledge both their Latino and non-Latino heritage in the ethnicity question, the ancestry question is still available to them in what was formerly known as the long form questionnaire and is now known as the American Community Survey.

Latino Identification

On the U.S. census, Latinos must select their Latino identification as an ethnicity, and are then faced with the choice of identifying as white, black, Asian or Pacific Islander, American Indian or Alaskan Native, or some other race (Office of Management and Budget 1997). In general, most Latinos select "white" or "other," though attempts have been made to deter Latinos from selecting "other" (Saenz 2004). However, the percentage of individuals who so identify as one race or another varies significantly across and within the Latino ethnic groups (Bonilla-Silva 2004; Qian 2004; Saenz 2004). There are many speculated reasons why this is so, ranging from a sense of national identity, variations in skin color, and levels of assimilation (Massey and Denton 1992; Saenz 2004; Umaña-Taylor and Fine 2001). Some of the racial identifiers that are written in can tell a story as to how some Latinos feel about the current racial categories – i.e. "Chicano," "La Raza," etc. (Massey and Denton 1992).

The 2000 census reveals that Cubans are most likely to select "white," followed by South Americans. Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Other Latinos are almost equally as likely to select "white" as they are to select "other," but the "white" option has a slightly

higher frequency. Dominicans and Central Americans are most likely to select "other," with a significant portion of Dominicans also selecting "black." These trends imply that skin color most likely plays a large part in how Latinos racially identify themselves with the categories given. Along with this, approximately 6 percent of all Latinos selected a multiracial option (Saenz 2004), though once again, not all of these Latinos are necessarily multiracial but rather were confused by or dissatisfied with the question (Farley 2002).

From this we can see that it is important to account for the variation in identification choices across the different Latino ethnic groups (Umaña-Taylor and Fine 2001). They exhibit variation across groups not only when it comes to identification, but also in terms of the prevalence of intermarriage with non-Latino whites and with regards to other social characteristics such as education levels and integration with non-Latino whites (Gurak and Fitzpatrick 1982; Umaña-Taylor and Fine 2001). Other factors apart from variation across Latino groups play large parts in the process of racial/ethnic identification for multiracial/ethnic individuals. These are divided into micro level (individual) factors and macro level (structural) factors, following the example of Saenz et al. (1995), in order to capture a more complex perspective on how multiracial/ethnic families socialize their children and are socialized by the environment in which they live (Miller 1992).

Micro Level Factors

Latino/Non-Latino White Families

With the steady rise in Latino/non-Latino white intermarriage from the mid-20th century onwards, we now have a sizable population of Latino/non-Latino white families who are worth studying (Telles and Ortiz 2008). It is first important to note that the propensity for Latinos to intermarry is largely dependent on group size. For instance, in areas where there are not large Latino populations, Latinos are more likely to intermarry than they are in areas where there are large Latino populations, a theory that holds true in the intermarriage literature (Kalmijn 1998; Lee and Edmonston 2006; Lichter et al. 2007; Telles and Ortiz 2008). The likelihood of intermarriage is also dependent upon nativity.

Foreign-born Latinos are less likely to intermarry for a variety of reasons ranging from cultural barriers to socioeconomic status to the possibility that immigrant Latinos are already married when they arrive in the United States (Saenz 2004; Telles and Ortiz 2008). The other explanation is that they *are* marrying in the United States, but it is to native-born Latinos and not native-born members of other racial groups. The growing immigrant population could account for why we have seen a decrease in the percentage of intermarried Latinos, especially since the decrease primarily took place with the foreign-born Latino population. A trend that persists, however, is that Latinas are more likely to intermarry than Latinos (Saenz 2004).

An issue which makes the children in these families unique is the debate over whether they are multiethnic and monoracial or multiethnic *and* multiracial. As

mentioned previously, the census handles Hispanic/Latino identity as an ethnicity rather than a race (Office of Management and Budge 1997). Based on these census guidelines, while one may say that they are Latino, their race can be the same as someone who is non-Latino. Take for instance the case of someone who says that they are Latino white and is married to a non-Latino white. This is the most common Latino/non-Latino couple (Telles and Ortiz 2008). As they are both categorized as white, it is technically not an interracial marriage. It *is*, however, an interethnic marriage. The question is whether to remain consistent with the census definitions.

González et al. (2006) provide an interesting discussion on this particular topic. Although they opted to remain consistent with the census guidelines and refer to these children as "biethnic," I argue that it is important to acknowledge that many of these children are also essentially multiracial due to the evidence that a significant number of Latinos would have preferred to select a Latino category on the census race question rather than the categories provided. These are the individuals who instead are likely to have selected "other" and wrote in a Latino identifier (Farley 2002; Massey and Denton 1992; Saenz 2004). As mentioned earlier, Farley (2002) points out that individuals who selected white and "other" with a Latino identifier made up roughly one third of those who were counted as multiracial in the 2000 Census. Farley (2002) chose to exclude these individuals from the multiracial population, arguing that they were individuals who were trying to create a category for themselves since none of the available categories seemed appropriate. However, it is possible that a portion of these individuals may in fact be multiracial (Latino/non-Latino white), and for this reason they ought to be

included in the multiracial population until further exploration of their ancestry and other racial/ethnic indicators say otherwise.

Parental Influence on Multiracial/ethnic Identity

As with most multiracial/ethnic families, the dynamics of Latino/non-Latino white families are driven largely by the cultural traits brought in by the parents. Latino parents are more likely to teach their children about the cultural background of being Latino. This can include Spanish-language maintenance, ethnic pride, and cultural traditions (González et al. 2006; Telles and Ortiz 2008). This ethnic socialization plays a large part in encouraging children to identify with their ethnic background (González et al. 2006; Weisman 2001). Weisman (2001) especially stresses the importance of language as a vehicle for cultural and ethnic identity. In Latino/non-Latino white families, if the Latino parent is encouraging the use of the Spanish language, we can expect to see the children identify at least partially with their Latino background.

The purpose of many of the existing studies on multiracial/ethnic identity has been to see what influences the decision of an individual or the decisions of others to identify or be identified with one parent or the other, or in recent cases, with both parents. Brunsma (2005) points out that though studies have tended to look at multiracial/ethnic adults, it is important to study multiracial/ethnic adolescents since racial awareness and socialization starts at a young age within and outside of the family (González et al. 2006; Qian 2004). For this reason, many of the more recent and prominent studies have examined samples of adolescents (Bratter and Heard 2009; Brunsma 2005; Qian 2004; Saenz et al. 1995; Xie and Goyette 1997). However, when

using census data, it is more often the case than not that the questionnaire is being filled out by a parent with little to no input from the children (Brunsma 2005; Goldstein and Morning 2002; Holloway et al. 2009). Bradshaw (1992) also points out that even if a child is strongly influenced by the ethnic socialization that they receive from their parents, the world outside of their family may still perceive them as something different from how they may identify themselves. Self identity and imposed identity do not always agree.

Nevertheless, it is still important to understand how parents identify their multiracial/ethnic children, and whether the characteristics of the parents affect how they identify their children. How interracial/ethnic parents identify their children can provide implications as to how parents attempt to socialize their children towards one identity or another (Brunsma 2005). González et al. (2006) point out the strong role that familial influence has on the identity of multiracial/ethnic adolescents, as it is the first and most lasting institution that they belong to, a point also made by Qian (2004). This is especially so for Latino or partially Latino families, as they place a particular emphasis on culture and ethnicity (Del Rio 1999; González et al. 2006). Perhaps the largest factor that researchers consider with regards to parental influence on multiracial/ethnic identity is the gender of the minority parent (Thornton 1992).

There have been many findings concerning the significance of parental gender in determining the identification of multiracial/ethnic children, particularly in conjunction with other factors such as the status of the parents (education, nativity, income, occupation, etc). That is to say, the gender of the parent is more often used as an

explanatory variable by means of their other characteristics (Bratter and Heard 2009; González et al. 2006; Holloway et al. 2009). What has generally been discovered is that children are more likely to identify with the race of their father than that of their mother due to families being traditionally patriarchal in nature (Brunsma 2005; Holloway et al. 2009; Qian 2004; Saenz et al. 1995; Xie and Goyette 1997). González et al. (2006), however, observe that when studying Latinos, if the mother is Latina then the children exhibit higher levels of ethnic socialization, more so than children whose mothers are white (Del Rio 1999). However, once again the patriarchal nature of Latino families could lead to minority identification for the child if the father is Latino (Waters 1990). Thus, the literature is conflicted on how exactly parental gender associated with minority status affects the multiracial/ethnic identity of the children.

Bratter and Heard (2009) examine parental influence even more closely by analyzing the effect that actual parental involvement has on the identification of a multiracial/ethnic individual. The effect that the level of the father's involvement in the child's life has was not only stronger than that of the mother's involvement, but also children were shown to be more sensitive to the extremes of the father's involvement. In cases where the father's involvement was very high and in cases where the father's involvement was very low, children were more likely to take on the father's identification. This is in agreement with the theory that fathers are more influential, but to a much greater extent. It is important to note, however, that Bratter and Heard's (2009) results are based upon the self-identification of the child, whereas those who have

used census data have relied on how the individual filling out the form identifies the child.

All of these results are even further complicated by various characteristics of the parents such as socioeconomic and nativity status (Qian 2004; Saenz et al. 1995). In the case of nativity status, Qian (2004), for example, found that individuals are more likely to carry a minority status if the minority parent is native-born than if the parent is foreign-born, explaining that those who are native-born are more aware of racial divides and competition in the United States. As we are more likely to encounter Latino/non-Latino white couples in which the Latino is native-born rather than foreign-born (Saenz 2004), the finding that native-born minority parents are more likely to push forward their minority identification is significant to this study.

As Qian (2004) explains, ethnic minorities in the United States may find that their ethnicity becomes more important as they encounter the majority population and come into competition with mainstream society, a concept also supported by Massey and Denton (1992) and Saenz et al. (1995). Portes (1984) discusses the idea that racial and ethnic awareness becomes more distinct as minority group individuals leave their ethnic communities. This concept could perhaps be applied to the case of minority individuals who marry outside of their ethnic communities, which can be especially important when we talk about Latinos marrying non-Latino whites. The possible racial and ethnic awareness that they experience as they marry outside of their community could be passed on to their children.

In terms of socioeconomic status, Xie and Goyette (1997) find that the likelihood of children in the third generation to be identified as Asian is positively related to the educational attainment of the Asian parent. Saenz et al. (1995) and Qian (2004) found similar results, in that higher educated minorities are more likely to be aware of racial divides in the United States, with spouses willing to understand their viewpoint. This is once again a finding also supported by Portes (1984). However, Massey and Denton (1992) found that Mexicans are more likely to identify as white as their socioeconomic status increases, which could have implications for how the children of Mexican/non-Latino white couples are identified. It is also possible that as the minority parent achieves higher socioeconomic status, they are more likely to retain their minority status as a sort of symbolic ethnicity, in that they do not actively participate in the culture of their ethnic group but still identify themselves as a member (Gans 1979). Qian (2004) also suggests that in cases where the parents are not at the same education level, the more educated parent will make the decisions or at least have more influence on how to identify their children.

Education and nativity may also interact with one another. For example, Xie and Goyette (1997) found that while education had little effect on the identification of first-generation Asian-white children (they were always more likely to be identified as Asian), education had a much more significant positive effect on third-generation Asian-white children to be identified as Asian. The implication is that first-generation multiracial/ethnic children will be given the minority identification as a result of the immigrant parent's ties to their native culture. This finding is partially supported by

Massey and Denton's (1992) study, which revealed that Mexicans' likelihood to identify as white is positively related to English propensity, implying that cultural ties through the Spanish language make a Latino identity more likely. It is important to note that Massey and Denton were referring specifically to foreign-born Mexicans, whereas the English propensity of Mexican Americans implies that they are more aware of their standing in society and thus are more involved in racial solidarity which drives them to identify as minorities. Meanwhile third generation children will be given the minority identification if the minority parent is highly educated, because the minority parent will also be more aware of racial divides (Xie and Goyette 1997).

Child's Gender

The gender of the child in relation to the gender of the parent is also important, as children tend to relate more with their same-sex parent (Starrels 1994). This is consistent despite research that has shown that mothers are generally more involved with their children than fathers, through emotion and affection (Bratter and Heard 2009; Harris, Frustenberg, and Marmer 1998; McKinney and Renk 2008; Yueng, Sandberg, Davis-Kean, and Hofferth 2001). Harris (2002) and Brunsma (2005) found that girls are more likely than boys to report or be reported as multiracial, though they stated that the reason for this is unclear. González et al. (2006) also found that boys in Latino/non-Latino white families are more likely to identify with being ethnic than girls. These findings do not tell the entire story though, for other studies did not find any differences in racial/ethnic identification by the gender of the child (Campbell 2006; Xie and

Goyette 1997). The disagreement within the literature on this particular factor makes it worthy of further investigation.

Macro Level Factors

The Influence of External Factors

Neighborhood racial composition has been shown to have a significant effect on how individuals racially identify themselves and their children (Holloway et al. 2009; Qian 2004; Saenz et al. 1995). By using a measure of racial/ethnic segregation, the diversity of the area in which a person lives can be tested to see if there is a significant relationship with identification. Qian (2004) found that for all racial groups, children of mixed parentage are more likely to take on the minority identification in areas with a higher concentration of that particular minority group. The finding that the likelihood of minority identification increases as the presence of minorities in an area increases is also confirmed by Saenz et al. (1995) and Xie and Goyette (1997) in their studies of Asian-white multiracial individuals. However, a somewhat contradicting story is told by Massey and Denton (1992), who found in their study focusing on Mexicans that as the Mexican population grew, as segregation from whites increased, and as the rate of immigration increased, Mexican individuals became more likely to racially identify as white (as opposed to "other"). This finding could possibly imply that the children of Latino/non-Latino white couples may be more likely to be identified as white as Latino populations grow in order to distance themselves from the growing immigrant population.

The finding that minority identification is more likely in areas that have large minority populations is especially true for blacks, so it is important to note that generally, studies of residential segregation have found that Asians and Latinos are much less residentially segregated from whites than blacks are (Bonilla-Silva 2004). Knowing this, we should expect to find varying degrees of residential segregation among the Latino population. Denton and Massey (1989) found that with regards to Caribbean Latinos, the degrees of separation varied by the skin color of the individuals, with the racially mixed experiencing a high degree of separation from non-Hispanic whites, though not necessarily as high as Latino blacks (Telles and Ortiz 2008).

To add to this discussion, Holloway et al. (2009) found that residential segregation has a much stronger effect on the variation of identification choices for Latinos and Asians than for blacks. This could possibly be explained by referring back to the "one-drop" rule concept, which states that blacks and black-white multiracials have a more difficult time of dismissing a minority identity. Harris (2002) suggests that even when black-white children live in predominantly white areas, they are more likely to say that they are multiracial than white, as they cannot completely separate themselves from being at least partially black. This is pertinent for the case of Latinos who racially identify as black.

Qian (2004) also found that children of Latino-white couples are more likely to be labeled as white in areas that are highly educated than in areas that are less educated, a finding also supported by Massey and Denton (1992). Thus, it is important to bear in mind the social and economic context in which a family lives, not just within their

household but also within their neighborhood or city. Particularly in the case of adolescents, group interaction outside of the home can be very influential on the overall development of the adolescent and how the parents raise their child.

However, the data that will be used in this study does not allow for analyses at the neighborhood level. The American Community Survey limits the geographic level of this study to the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) which is a much larger and more heterogeneous geographic area than a single neighborhood. For this reason, the theory which supports that Latino/non-Latino white children are more likely to be labeled white in higher SES areas cannot be tested.

Micro Level Hypotheses

The micro level hypotheses are primarily based on the characteristics of the parents, as the literature has shown these to be the most influential aspects of racial/ethnic identity and also because identification is chosen by the parents in the data.

H_1: *Race/Ethnicity and Gender*- The child is more likely to be identified with the Latino parent, with this relationship being stronger when the father is Latino due to findings which suggest the possibility of traditionally patriarchal nature of families.

H_2: *Nativity* – The child is more likely to be identified as Latino and to be assigned a non-white racial identity if the Latino parent is native-born, based on findings in the literature which suggest that native-born Latinos are more aware of racial and ethnic divides in the United States.

H_3: *Socioeconomic Status* – The child is more likely to be identified as Latino as the educational attainment of the Latino parent increases, based on findings that higher educated minorities are more likely to be aware of racial and ethnic divides. Although some findings have also indicates that Latinos adopt a white identity as their SES increases, the findings for the contrary are more prevalent in the literature.

H_4: *Culture* – The child is more likely to be identified as Latino if the Latino parent speaks Spanish in the home, especially so if the mother is Latina based on findings in the literature about the ways in which Latina mothers reinforce Latino culture. Speaking Spanish within the home is an effective way of making the family more aware of culture and ethnicity. If the Latino parent is speaking Spanish within the home, it can also imply that the non-Latino parent is willing to encourage Latino identification in their children by cooperating and perhaps also learning from the Spanish-speaking parent.

Macro Level Hypothesis

The macro level hypothesis is based on the ethnic composition of the geographic area in which the family lives, namely the Metropolitan Statistical Area.

H_5: *Ethnic Composition* - Latino identification and non-white identification is more likely for children in areas that have large minority populations, based on findings which have supported the idea that a large minority presence increases the likelihood of minority identification for multiracial/ethnic families.

CHAPTER III

DATA AND METHODOLOGY

Data Source

The analyses in this study utilize data from the 2005-2007 1% American Community Survey sample. The American Community Survey, which replaced what was known as the long form Census questionnaire, collects detailed demographic, social, economic, and housing information from 1% of the population in the United States annually. The benefits of using this data source are the availability of up-to-date information on households across the nation with access to pertinent information such as migration, income, and educational data.

Sample Selection

This study focuses on families consisting of a Latino parent whose race was indicated as white, black, American Indian, or other, a non-Latino white parent, and a child under the age of 18. The five largest Latino groups in the United States are Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, and Salvadorans. These Latino groups will be included and all others will be excluded. The decision to only use members from the five largest Latino groups is driven by intended analyses which will consider the effect of belonging to one Latino ethnic group as compared to another. The groups which are being excluded are small to begin with and will be even smaller once they are reduced down to only those who are intermarried to a non-Latino white. This also applies to Latinos whose race was indicated as something other than white, black,

American Indian or other. Latinos who selected any other race besides these will be excluded from the analysis. This is due to the very small amount of Latinos in these other racial groups once the sample is narrowed down to those who are married to a non-Latino white. Married couples which consist of a member of one of the selected Latino groups and a member of the non-Latino white group were extracted along with their eldest child under the age of 18 to create the sample for this study.

For the sake of avoiding complications, these families will only be those in which both biological parents and biological child live in the same household, and only the eldest child under the age of 18 will be considered part of the unit. Families which are separated by household in any way must be excluded, as there is no way to link children to their biological parents with public-use data if they do not live in the same household. Also families in which one of the parents was marked as a probable stepparent were also excluded. Being as how this study is concerned with the identification of multiracial/ethnic children, it is important to have data on the biological parents of the children and to also have the children living in the same household as their biological parents since this study intends to analyze the effects of parental influence on the racial/ethnic identification of their children.

The families are linked together using constructed variables provided in the dataset, retrieved from the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS), which identify the father (POPLOC), the mother (MOMLOC), and spouses (SPOCLOC) in each household and link them accordingly by their person number (PERNUM). The process of linking family members together consists of first creating three subdatasets –

a father dataset, a mother dataset, and a children dataset. The father and mother dataset are then merged together by household serial number, state ID, and the spouse linking variable mentioned previously. This couple dataset is then merged with the children dataset by household serial number, state ID, and the father and mother linking variables. After the merged dataset is created, only the cases which meet the criteria mentioned above are kept and all others are dropped. After merging and identifying the desired family units the total sample size is N = 15,861. This number represents the number of family units in the sample. Thus there are 15,861 fathers, 15,861 mothers, and 15,861 children.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable is the racial and ethnic identification of the children in the family units. This is comprised of one polytomous variable with four categories and one dichotomous variable, categorizing the children by whether or not they are identified as Latino and whether or not they are identified as white. Separating the racial and ethnic identification is necessary for the sake of comparison because technically, the child can never truly be identified by both the mother's and the father's racial and ethnic identities concurrently since the ethnicity question on the survey only allows one identifier. Thus, the child cannot be identified as both "Non-Latino" and, for example, "Mexican." For this reason, the dependent variable must treat the racial and ethnic identification of the child separately since one that cannot take on the ethnic identity of the mother and the father simultaneously, even though racially this is possible. This

study is focused on ethnic identification, and in that regard we are limited to singular identities.

The polytomous variable – implying nominal and unordered categories - is measured by how the children in the family units are ethnically identified. The categories for this variable, referred to as child ethnicity, are "Latino White," "Latino Other," "Non-Latino White" and "Non-Latino Other." Given that this is a multinomial model (discussed later), one category must serve as a comparison category. The comparison category is "Latino White." Those in the "Latino White" category are children who are ethnically identified as Latino, be it Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Salvadoran, or Dominican, and are also racially identified as white only. Those in the "Latino Other" category are children who are identified as Latino but have a racial identification other than white only. They can be either identified as black, American Indian or Alaskan Native, some other race, or any combination of these identifiers including white since the census allows the respondent to select multiple racial identifiers. Those in the "Non-Latino White" category are children who are ethnically identified as non-Latino and are racially identified as white only. Those in the "Non-Latino Other" category are children who are ethnically identified as non-Latino but are racially identified as something other than white only. Like the "Latino Other" category, children in this category include those who are racially identified as white in combination with something else.

The dichotomous variable, which will be used in the multilevel analyses, indicates whether the child is identified as Latino or non-Latino, with a value of 1

representing children who are identified as non-Latino. Because of the dichotomous nature of this variable, the multilevel analyses will utilize binomial logistic regression, predicting the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino rather than Latino. Table 1 displays the descriptions of the dichotomous and polytomous dependent variables.

Table 1. Dependent Variables

Variable Name	Description	Operationalization
Child Ethnicity (polytomous)	The Latino ethnic identification of the child; polytomous variable	Child is categorized either as Latino or non-Latino 3 = Non-Latino Other 2 = Non-Latino White 1 = Latino Other 0 = Latino White
Child Ethnicity (dichotomous)	The Latino ethnic identification of the child; dichotomous variable	1 = Non-Latino 0 = Latino

Independent Variables

The independent variables in this study are divided into two types in accordance with the multilevel model that is being applied. The first type of variables is at the micro level, which consist of individual level variables that measure characteristics of both the parents and the child in each family unit. The second type is at the macro level, which consists of an aggregate level variable that measures the ethnic composition of the geographic area, specifically the Metropolitan Statistical Area that the family unit lives in. These two types are necessary for the sake of testing the hypotheses in this study

which pertain to both how individual characteristics and contextual characteristics affect the racial/ethnic identification of multiracial/ethnic children.

The first main set of independent variables at the micro level is the racial/ethnic identifications of the parents. This is divided into three separate variables. The first is gender of the Latino parent, which is a dummy variable with a value of 1 indicating that the father is Latino and a value of 0 indicating that the mother is Latino. When one parent is Latino, the other is obviously non-Latino white, so this variable also serves to identify which parent is the non-Latino white parent. The second variable is a set of dummy variables that indicate which Latino ethnic group the Latino parent belongs to. Thus the groups are Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Salvadoran and Dominican, with a value of 1 indicating membership in the group. The purpose of these dummy variables is to compare the differences across Latino ethnic groups, based on previous findings which indicate significant differences in racial and ethnic identification across these groups.

The third variable is also a set of dummy variables that indicates the racial identification of the Latino parent. The possible choices are white, black, American Indian or Alaskan Native, and other. This set of dummy variables serves a similar purpose as the set of Latino ethnic dummy variables, namely to compare differences across Latino racial groups. This is motivated by findings particularly concerning Latino blacks, who possibly experience stronger ties to a minority identity. Previous studies have shown that multiracial families with a black parent are the least likely to identify their children as white (Holloway et al. 2009). Thus it is important to incorporate these

variables in order to strengthen the models. Tables 2 and 3 summarize the independent variables in this study.

The second independent variable is the birthplace of the Latino parent, which serves as a predictor for how nativity affects the racial and ethnic identification of the child. This variable is a dummy variable, with a value of 1 indicating that the Latino parent was born outside of the United States and a value of 0 indicating that the Latino parent was born in the United States. Accounting for the birthplace of the Latino parent is very important given the significant prevalence of foreign-born Latinos in the United States and the way in which their experience with race and ethnicity in the United States differs from the native-born population. The citizenship status of the Latino parent is not included in the analysis due to the high multicollinearity with the birthplace of the Latino parent.

Table 2. Level-1 Independent Variables for Models 1 & 2

Variable Name	Description	Operationalization
Latino Parent	The gender of the Latino parent; dichotomous variable	1 = Latino father 0 = Latina mother
Latino Parent's Ethnicity	The ethnic origin of the Latino parent, either Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Salvadoran, or Dominican; set of dummy variables	1 = Mexican, 0 = Other 1 = Puerto Rican, 0 = Other 1 = Cuban, 0 = Other 1 = Salvadoran, 0 = Other 1 = Dominican, 0 = Other
Latino Parent's Race	The racial identification of the Latino parent, either white, black, American Indian or Alaskan Native, or some other race; set of dummy variables	1 = white, 0 = other 1 = black, 0 = other 1 = AI/AN, 0 = other 1 = some other race, 0 = other
Latino Parent's Education	The educational attainment of the Latino parent, either less than high school, high school, some college, or college degree or higher; set of dummy variables	1 = < High School, 0 = Other 1 = High school, 0 = Other 1 = Some college, 0 = Other 1 = College degree +, 0 = Other
Non-Latino White Parent's Education	The educational attainment of the non-Latino white parent, either less than high school, high school, some college, or college degree or higher; set of dummy variables	1 = < High School, 0 = Other 1 = High school, 0 = Other 1 = Some college, 0 = Other 1 = College degree +, 0 = Other
Latino Parent's Birthplace	Whether or not the Latino parent was born in the United States; dichotomous variable	1 = Foreign-born 0 = Native-born
Latino Parent's Language in the Home	Whether or not the Latino parent speaks Spanish in the home; dichotomous variable	1 = Speaks Spanish in the home 0 = Speaks English in the home
Latino Parent's Age	Set of dummy variables	2 = 35 and older 1 = 25 to 34 0 = Less than 25
Non-Latino White Parent's Age	Set of dummy variables	2 = 35 and older 1 = 25 to 34 0 = Less than 25
Child's Sex	The sex of the child, female or male; dichotomous variable	1 = Female 0 = Male
Child's Age	Ages 18 and under; continuous variable	Continuous

Table 3. Level-2 Independent Variable for Models 1 & 2

Variable Name	Description	Operationalization
% Latino	Percentage of Latinos in MSA; continuous variable	Continuous

Language is a critical indicator of culture and socialization within the household, and for this reason an independent variable which pertains to the language spoken in the household is included in this study. The variable for language spoken in the household is also coded as a dummy variable. A value of 1 indicates that a language other than English is spoken in the home.

In order to measure the socioeconomic status of the parents, a set of dummy variables which measure the educational attainment of the parents is included. Educational attainment is divided into four categories – less than high school, high school, some college, and a college degree or higher. To capture the effect that the educational attainment of the Latino parent has on the identification of the child as compared to the effect that the educational attainment of the non-Latino parent has, the educational attainment is split so that there is a set of dummy variables for the Latino parent and a set of dummy variables for the non-Latino parent. The age of the parents is also included, once again distinguishing between the age of the Latino parent and the age of the non-Latino parent. This variable is also set up as a set of dummy variables, with the parents being either less than 25 years of age, 25 to 34 years of age, or 35 and older.

The last micro level independent variables are the sex of the child and the age of the child, which a value of 1 indicating that the child is female. At the micro level, this study controls for the age of the child. It should once again be noted that only children 18 and under are included in this study. The age of the child is worth including due to the possibility of a child having more influence over decision making as he/she approaches adulthood.

The independent variable at the macro level is the racial/ethnic composition of the area in which the family lives. This is measured at the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) level by the percentage of Latinos living in the MSA. The purpose of this variable is to test the macro level hypothesis that the racial/ethnic composition of the neighborhood has an effect on how multiracial/ethnic children are racially/ethnically identified. The limitation of using the Metropolitan Statistical Area as the geographic distinction is that this study cannot actually measure the effects of neighborhood racial/ethnic composition due to the size of the MSAs. For this reason, the socioeconomic composition of the area in which the families live cannot be adequately measured due to the Metropolitan Statistical Area being a significantly large area containing many neighborhoods of varying socioeconomic levels.

Methods

This study will incorporate two models to test the stated hypotheses. The first model tests the effects of the Latino parent's characteristics on the likelihood of a child being identified as Latino white, Latino other, non-Latino white, or non-Latino other. The second model tests the effects of the non-Latino white parent's characteristics on the

same outcome. This model will use multinomial logistic regression, given that the dependent variable is both multinomial and unordered. This model also uses a multilevel approach, specifically multilevel binomial logistic regression, as it will test both the micro level hypotheses as well as the macro level hypothesis associated with the child's ethnic identification. The single level analyses will predict the outcome of the polytomous dependent variable, but most of the conclusions will be drawn from the multilevel analyses which predict the outcome of the dichotomous dependent variable. What makes the models multilevel is the incorporation of an aggregate level independent variable, the ethnic composition of the MSA in which the family lives. Binomial logistic regression is used because, once again, the dependent variable is dichotomous and thus fails the OLS assumption of normal distribution. Using the dichotomous version of the dependent variable in the multilevel analysis rather than the polytomous version allows for more easily interpretable results.

The use of a multilevel model is justified due to the significance of the variation in the dependent variable which occurs between MSAs as well as within. In other words, the likelihood of Latino identification significantly varies by MSAs. As H_5 states, it is expected that this is due in part to the ethnic composition of the MSAs, specifically the percent Latino in the geographic area. To show that the variation which occurs between MSAs is significant, a one-way ANOVA test was run in order to estimate the intraclass correlation (ICC), which "represents…the proportion of variance" in the dependent variable between MSAs and "is estimated by substituting the estimated

variance components for their respected parameters" (Raudenbush and Byrk 2002). Below in Table 4 are the results of the one-way ANOVA test.

Table 4. Intraclass Correlation: One-Way ANOVA for Models 1 & 2

Random Effect	Standard Deviation	Variance Component	Df	Chi^2	p-value	ICC
MSA % Latino	.06170	.00381	279	544.50028	0.000	1.48%
Level-1 Effect	.45093	.20334				

$$ICC = [\tau_{00}/(\tau_{00} + \sigma^2)]*100$$

The ICC indicates that 1.48 percent of the variance in the dependent variable occurs between MSAs. With a p-value of 0.000 and a Chi-squared of 544.5, this value is significant and, thus, justifies the use of a multilevel model in order to account for the variation at level-2. Thus in Models 1 and 2 I estimate the probability of a child being identified as non-Latino rather than Latino, while taking into account the contextual effects of ethnic composition in the selected geographic area. This model is estimated using HLM 6.08 software which allows for these types of methods. The method being used, known as a hierarchical generalized linear model and is similar to a single level binomial model in that it is estimated by maximum likelihood. However, it is double iterative, meaning that it performs iterations at both the micro level and the macro level (Raudenbush and Bryk, 2002).

Model 1 – Child Ethnicity Predicted by Characteristics of the Latino Parent

The dependent variable in this model is child ethnicity, a multinomial unordered variable which categorizes respondents (children) as either being ethnically and racially identified as Latino white, Latino other, non-Latino white, or non-Latino other. The purpose of this model is to measure the effects of the Latino parent's characteristics on the likelihood of a child being racially identified with respect to the identification of their parents. Because the dependent variable is both multinomial and unordered, the method for this analysis is multinomial logistic regression. Multinomial logistic regression estimates sets of logit coefficients for each category of the dependent variable (there are four categories in this dependent variable). The coefficients, four for each independent variable as there are four categories of the dependent variable, indicate the log odds of the independent variable leading to one category of the dependent variable as opposed to another selected category which serves as the base category for comparison. The base category in this model is "Latino white," which consists of children who are ethnically identified as Latino and racially identified as white only. The model is estimated using maximum likelihood.

In Model 1 there is also a multilevel analysis, predicting the outcome of the dichotomous version of the dependent variable, specifically whether the child is identified as Latino or non-Latino. This analysis includes the previously specified level-1 independent variables as well as the level-2 ethnic composition variable.

Model 2 – Child Ethnicity Predicted by the Characteristics of the Non-Latino Parent

The dependent variable in the second model is also child ethnicity, but this model incorporates the characteristics of the non-Latino parent as predictors of the dependent variable. This model is thus meant to measure the effect of the non-Latino white parent's characteristics on the racial and ethnic identification of the child, which can then be compared to the first model which utilizes the characteristics of the Latino parent. Like the first model, the methodological approaches used in this model are multinomial logistic regression, predicting the log odds of a child belonging in one category in comparison to another utilizing maximum likelihood, and multilevel binomial logistic regression, predicting the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino rather than Latino while incorporating a contextual predictor. The base category for comparison in the multinomial analysis is once again "Latino white," which consists of children who are ethnically identified as Latino and racially identified as white only.

Structural Model at Level-1 for Model 1 Multilevel Analysis

$$\text{CHILDETHNICITY} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Latino Parent}) + \beta_2(\text{Puerto Rican}) + \beta_3(\text{Cuban}) + \beta_4(\text{Salvadoran}) + \beta_5(\text{Dominican}) + \beta_6(\text{Language in the Home}) + \beta_7(\text{Birthplace}) + \beta_8(\text{Age 25-34}) + \beta_9(\text{Age 35+}) + \beta_{10}(\text{Black}) + \beta_{11}(\text{AI/AN}) + \beta_{12}(\text{Other}) + \beta_{13}(\text{High School Diploma}) + \beta_{14}(\text{Some College}) + \beta_{15}(\text{Bachelor's or Higher}) + \beta_{16}(\text{Child's Sex}) + \beta_{17}(\text{Child's Age}) + r$$

Structural Model at Level-2 for Model 1 Multilevel Analysis

$$\beta_0 = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{Percent Latino}) + u_0$$

$$\beta_1 = \gamma_{10}$$

$\beta_2 = \gamma_{20}$

$\beta_3 = \gamma_{30}$

$\beta_4 = \gamma_{40}$

$\beta_5 = \gamma_{50}$

$\beta_6 = \gamma_{60}$

$\beta_7 = \gamma_{70}$

$\beta_8 = \gamma_{80}$

$\beta_9 = \gamma_{90}$

$\beta_{10} = \gamma_{100}$

$\beta_{11} = \gamma_{110}$

$\beta_{12} = \gamma_{120}$

$\beta_{13} = \gamma_{130}$

$\beta_{14} = \gamma_{140}$

$\beta_{15} = \gamma_{150}$

$\beta_{16} = \gamma_{160}$

$\beta_{17} = \gamma_{170}$

Structural Model at Level-1 for Model 2 Multilevel Analysis

CHILDETHNICITY = β_0 + β_1(White Parent) + β_2(Age 25-34) + β_3(Age 35+) + β_4(High School Diploma) + β_5(Some College) + β_6(Bachelor's or Higher)+ β_7(Child's Sex) + β_8(Child's Age) + r

Structural Model at Level-2 for Model 1Multilevel Analysis

$\beta_0 = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}$(HISPTOT) + u_0

$\beta_1 = \gamma_{10}$

$\beta_2 = \gamma_{20}$

$\beta_3 = \gamma_{30}$

$\beta_4 = \gamma_{40}$

$\beta_5 = \gamma_{50}$

$\beta_6 = \gamma_{60}$

$\beta_7 = \gamma_{70}$

$\beta_8 = \gamma_{80}$

Because this study incorporates several logit models, it is important at this point to restate the hypotheses behind the analyses.

H_1: *Race/Ethnicity and Gender*- The child is more likely to be identified with the Latino parent, with this relationship being stronger when the father is Latino due to findings which suggest the possibility of traditionally patriarchal families.

H_2: *Nativity* – The child is more likely to be identified as Latino and to be assigned a non-white racial identity if the Latino parent is native-born, based on findings in the literature which suggest that native-born Latinos are more aware of racial and ethnic divides in the United States.

H_3: *Socioeconomic Status* – The child is more likely to be identified as Latino as the educational attainment of the Latino parent increases, based on findings that higher educated minorities are more likely to be aware of racial and ethnic divides. Although some findings have also indicates that Latinos adopt a white identity as

their SES increases, the findings for the contrary are more prevalent in the literature.

H_4: *Culture* – The child is more likely to be identified as Latino if the Latino parent speaks Spanish in the home, especially so if the mother is Latina based on findings in the literature about the ways in which Latina mothers reinforce Latino culture. Speaking Spanish within the home is an effective way of making the family more aware of culture and ethnicity. If the Latino parent is speaking Spanish within the home, it can also imply that the non-Latino parent is willing to encourage Latino identification in their children by cooperating and perhaps also learning from the Spanish-speaking parent.

H_5: *Ethnic Composition* - Latino identification and non-white identification is more likely for children in areas that have large minority populations, based on findings which have supported the idea that a large minority presence increases the likelihood of minority identification for multiracial/ethnic families.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

Overview

This chapter will begin with a set of general descriptive statistics about the data which will be used in this study. Again I reiterate that the observations in this study are family units which contain a father, a mother, and their eldest biological child in the household under the age of 18. One of the parents must be a non-Latino white while the other parent must be a Latino of Mexican, Cuban, Puerto Rican, Dominican or Salvadoran origin. Following the descriptive statistics will be the analyses behind the three models described previously. The analyses in Model 1 serve to predict the ethnic identification of the child using the characteristics of the Latino parent. Thus in the single level analyses I predict whether the child is identified as Latino White, Latino Other, Non-Latino White, or Non-Latino Other. In the multilevel analyses, I predict only whether the child is identified as Latino or non-Latino. The analyses in Model 2 predict the same dependent variable but they incorporate the characteristics of the non-Latino white parent as predictors instead of those of the Latino parent. These models use multinomial logistic regression and multilevel binomial logistic regression. Multinomial logistic regression is used due to the categorical and unordered nature of the polytomous version of the dependent variable and multilevel binomial logistic regression is used due to the dichotomous version of the dependent variable and the use of a contextual variable.

Descriptive Statistics

This section describes the general characteristics of the parents and children in the sample. The sample in this study consists of 15,861 metropolitan households, with each household containing one Latino/non-Latino white multiracial/ethnic family unit. While all of the households are multiethnic (one Latino parent and one non-Latino parent), not all households are multiracial by census definitions. Out of the total sample, 60.7 percent are monoracial households, meaning that both parents are racially identified as white.

Parental Characteristics

I will begin by describing the racial/ethnic identification of the parents. Amongst the fathers, 51.7 percent (N=8,198) are non-Latino white, with the remaining 48.3 percent (N=7,663) of the fathers belonging to a variety of Latino ethnic groups. Of the Latino fathers, 70.6 percent (N=5,410) are Mexican, 18.06 percent (N=1,384) are Puerto Rican, 8.3 percent (N=632) are Cuban, 1.8 percent (N=135) are Salvadoran, and 1.3 percent (N=102) are Dominican. In terms of racial identity amongst the Latino fathers, 58.4 percent (N=4,472) are white, 1.0 percent (N=72) are black, 1.2 percent (N=91) are American Indian or Alaskan Native, 35.8 percent (N=2,741) are some other race, and 3.8 percent (N=287) are white and some other race. Parents who were identified as white and some other race are included because of the tendency by some Latinos to select white and then write in a Latino ethnicity for their other race.

Conversely, 48.3 percent of the mothers are non-Latina white and are the partners of the 7,663 Latino fathers. Of the 51.7 percent remaining mothers who are

Latina, 72.4 percent (N=5,935) are Mexican, 15.9 percent (N=1,299) are Puerto Rican, 7.9 percent (N=650) are Cuban, 1.8 percent (N=144) are Salvadoran, and 2.1 percent (N=170) are Dominican. The racial distribution for the Latino mothers is similar to that of the Latino fathers - 62.9 percent (N=5,135) are white, 0.7 percent (N=50) are black, 1.1 percent (N=90) are American Indian or Alaskan Native, 32.8 percent (N=2,637) are some other race, and 3.3 percent (268) are white and some other race. These numbers are about what we would come to expect, especially with regards to the large amount of Latinos who indicate that they are some other race, reflecting the sentiment by many Latinos that none of the available racial identifiers apply to them.

The percentage of parents who are foreign-born are similar between fathers and mothers, with 16.5 percent (N=2,623) of fathers and 17.0 percent (N=2,698) of mothers born outside of the United States. In terms of language, 29.5 percent (N=4,683) of fathers and 32.5 percent (N=5,161) of mothers speak a language other than English in the home.

I turn now to the educational attainment levels of the parents. Out of the fathers, 8.0 percent (N=1,262) have completed less than high school, 23.2 percent (N=3,674) have received a high school diploma or equivalent, 34.8 percent (N=5511) have had some college experience, and 34.1 percent (N=5414) have received a bachelor's degree or higher. Out of the mothers, 6.2 percent (N=975) have completed less than high school, 21.7 percent (N=3,439) have received a high school diploma or equivalent, 37.9 percent have had some college experience, and 34.3 percent (N=5,437) have received a bachelor's degree or higher. In terms of educational attainment amongst the non-Latino

white parents and the Latino parents, 9.0 percent (N=1,428) of the Latino parents have completed less than high school, 22.7 percent (N=3,607) have received a high school diploma or equivalent, 36.5 percent (N=5,791) have had some college experience, and 31.7 percent (N=5,035) have received a bachelor's degree or higher. Of the non-Latino white parents, 5.1 percent (N=809) have completed less than high school, 22.1 percent (N=3,506) have received a high school diploma or equivalent, 36.1 percent (N=5,730) have had some college experience, and 36.7 percent (N=5,816) have received a bachelor's degree or higher. It is important to note that the educational attainment outcomes were found to be generally better for the non-Latino white parents than for the Latino parents, though this difference is more pronounced amongst the fathers than the mothers.

Child Characteristics

The most important aspect of the child characteristics which needs to be looked at is racial/ethnic identification. Beginning with race, 73.9 percent (N=11,726) are white, 0.5 percent (N=84) are black, 0.5 percent (N=77) are American Indian or Alaskan Native, 12.4 percent (N=1,963) are some other race, 0.6 percent (N=94) are white and black, 0.4 percent (N=60) are white and American Indian or Alaskan Native, 11.6

percent (N=1,846) are white and some other race, 0.1 percent (N=9) are black and some other race, and less than a tenth of a percent (N=2) are American Indian or Alaskan Native and some other race. The ethnicity statistics are even more telling of the way in which racial identity varies so dramatically amongst this multiracial/ethnic population, with 29.2 percent (N=4,626) identified as non-Latino, 52.5 percent (N=8,326) identified as Mexican, 11.7 percent (N=1,848) identified as Puerto Rican, 4.6 percent (N=721) identified as Cuban, 1.1 percent (N=171) identified as Salvadoran, and 1.1 percent (N=169) identified as Dominican. The most interesting thing about these numbers is the 70.8 percent total who are identified as Latino given the fact that these are children of Latino/non-Latino white families. The median age of the children in the sample is 10, with of course the maximum age being 18. The sex of the children is almost half and half with 48.1 percent (7,635) female and 51.9 percent (8,226) male. The descriptive statistics for the independent variables in Models 1 and 2 are displayed in Tables 5, 6, and 7.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics for Model 1, Latino Parents

Variable Name	Mean	SD
Latino Parent	0.5	0.5
Ethnic Group		
Mexican Parent	0.7	0.5
Puerto Rican Parent	0.2	0.4
Cuban Parent	0.1	0.3
Salvadoran Parent	<0.1	0.1
Dominican Parent	<0.1	0.1
Language in the Home	0.5	0.5
Birthplace	0.3	0.4
Age		
Less than 25	<0.1	0.2
25 – 34	0.3	0.5
35 and Up	0.7	0.5
Race		
White	0.6	0.5
Black	<0.1	0.1
AI/AN	<0.1	0.1
Other	0.4	0.5
Education		
No Diploma	0.1	0.3
High School Diploma	0.2	0.4
Some College	0.4	0.5
Bachelor's or Higher	0.3	0.5

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for Model 2, White Parents

Variable Name	Mean	SD
White Parent	0.5	0.5
Education		
No Diploma	0.1	0.2
High School Diploma	0.2	0.4
Some College	0.4	0.5
Bachelor's or Higher	0.4	0.5
Age		
Less than 25	<0.1	0.2
25 to 34	0.3	0.5
35 and Up	0.7	0.5

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics for Models 1 & 2, Child Characteristics

Variable Name	Mean	SD
Sex	0.5	0.5
Age	9.4	5.5

Model 1

The analyses in Model 1 are intended to predict how children are ethnically identified using the characteristics of the Latino parents. The dependent variable in this model is child ethnicity, which is polytomous for the single level analysis and dichotomous for the multilevel analysis. There are four categories in the polytomous dependent variable, "Latino White," "Latino Other," "Non-Latino White," and "Non-Latino Other." Those in the "Latino White" category are children who are ethnically identified as Latino and racially identified as white only. Those in the "Latino Other" category are those who are ethnically identified as Latino and racially identified as something other than white. "Non-Latino White" children are ethnically identified as non-Latino and racially identified as white only and "Non-Latino Other" children are ethnically identified as non-Latino but racially identified as something other than white. Table 8 displays the distribution of the polytomous dependent variable.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics for Child Ethnicity, Polytomous

Category	Percent %	N
Latino White	46.5	7,375
Latino Other	24.3	3,860
Non-Latino White	27.4	4,351
Non-Latino Other	1.7	275

As expected, the largest category is the Latino white category at 46.5 percent. Given that all of these children have a Latino parent and a non-Latino white parent, this is not surprising. What does stand out, however, is that the second largest group is the non-Latino white group at 27.4 percent. These are children who, despite having a Latino parent, are not in any way identified with that parent, instead being identified exclusively with their non-Latino white parent. The second largest group is the Latino other group. Most likely the size of this group can be attributed to the children who are racially identified as white and other, given that the white and other children are the third largest overall racial group in the sample. To further examine factors which influence the variation in the ethnic identification of the children, Table 9 displays the distributions for the dependent variable by the ethnic group of the Latino parent.

Table 9. Descriptive Statistics for Child Ethnicity by Latino Parent Ethnic Group

Category	Latino White	Latino Other	Non-Lat. White	Non-Lat. Other
Mexican	45.9	27.3	25.0	1.8
Puerto Rican	50.5	18.8	29.1	1.7
Cuban	48.1	8.3	42.4	1.2
Salvadoran	33.0	30.1	33.3	3.6
Dominican	37.5	25.0	35.7	1.8

The results from Table 9 suggest distinct differences in how children are identified depending on the ethnic origin of their Latino parent. Children with a Mexican parent are overall more likely to be identified as Latino white, with the second most common identification being Latino other. However, a quarter of them were also identified as non-Latino white. Children with Puerto Rican parents showed a slightly more distinct variation, with half of them being identified as Latino white, but far more of them being identified as non-Latino white as compared to Latino other. This similar trend is the most pronounced amongst children with Cuban parents. Less than half of them are identified as Latino white, while 42.0 percent of them are identified as non-Latino white. This is consistent with findings which suggest that Cubans are more inclined to adopt a white identity (Saenz 2004). For children with Salvadoran parents and Dominican parents, the variation across the dependent variable is less pronounced.

Next I present the multinomial logistic regression results for Model 1 which tests the first four hypotheses regarding parents' race/ethnicity, parents' nativity status, parents' socioeconomic status, and culture. I regress the characteristics of the Latino

parent on the dependent variable, predicting the odds of the child being identified as Latino other, non-Latino white, or non-Latino other in comparison to being identified as Latino white. Looking first at Table 10, I refer to the percent change in the odds ratios for the sake of easy interpretation.

The results indicate that the gender of the Latino parent was only significantly related to the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino white in contrast to the child being identified as Latino white. Having a Latino father decreases the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino white by 14.0 percent. Having a Latino father does not make a significant difference in the child being identified as Latino other or Non-Latino other in contrast to being identified as Latino white. Similarly, the ethnic origin of the Latino parent was most related to the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino white in contrast to being identified as Latino white. Compared to having a Mexican parent, having a Puerto Rican parent increases the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino white in contrast to Latino white by 14.6 percent, having a Cuban parent increases the odds by 103.5 percent, having a Salvadoran parent increases the odds by 75.2 percent, and having a Dominican parent increases the odds by 87.2 percent.

Thus overall, if the Latino parent is not Mexican, their child is more likely to be identified as non-Latino white in comparison to the children with a Mexican parent. The ethnic origin variables were not significant predictors of the other outcome categories except in the case of being the child being identified as Latino other in contrast to being identified as Latino white, where having a Puerto Rican parent in comparison to having a Mexican parent decreases the odds of the child being identified as Latino other by 16.3 percent.

Whether or not the Latino parent speaks Spanish in the home is also significantly related to the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino white in contrast to being identified as Latino white. Having a Latino parent who speaks Spanish in the home decreases the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino white by 35.5 percent. Another interesting finding that resulted from this analysis is that having a foreign-born Latino parent increases the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino white in contrast to Latino white by 25.8 percent. Neither the language of the Latino parent nor the birthplace of the Latino parent were significantly related to the odds of the child being identified as Latino other or non-Latino other in contrast to being identified as Latino white.

Table 10. Multinomial Results for Child Ethnicity, Latino Parents

Outcome:	Latino Other			Non-Latino White			Non-Latino Other		
	b	Exp(b)	%	b	Exp(b)	%	b	Exp(b)	%
Latino Father	-.029	.971	-2.9	-.151*	.860	-14.0	-.148	.862	-13.8
Ethnic Group									
Mexican Parent	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Puerto Rican Parent	-.178*	.837	-16.3	.137*	1.146	14.6	-.003	.997	-0.3
Cuban Parent	.030	1.030	3.0	.710*	2.035	103.5	.237	1.267	26.7
Salvadoran Parent	.081	1.084	8.4	.561*	1.752	75.2	.658	1.931	93.1
Dominican Parent	.177	1.193	19.3	.627*	1.872	87.2	-.069	.933	-6.7
Spanish in the Home	-.030	.971	-2.9	-.441*	.645	-35.5	-.128	.880	-12.0
Foreign-born	-.090	.914	-8.6	.230*	1.258	25.8	.152	1.164	16.4
Age									
Less than 25	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
25 to 34	.081	1.084	8.4	.145	1.156	15.6	.073	1.076	7.6
35 and Up	-.007	.993	-0.7	.106	1.112	11.2	.025	1.025	2.5
Race									
White	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Black	4.360*	78.271	7727	.666*	1.947	94.7	3.906*	49.687	4869
AI/AN	4.610*	100.493	9949	.499	1.647	64.7	2.903*	18.232	1723
Other	4.752*	115.834	11483	.955*	2.598	159.8	2.675*	14.517	1352
Education									
No Diploma	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High School Diploma	.110	1.116	11.6	-.029	.971	-2.9	-.064	.938	-6.2
Some College	.095	1.100	10.0	.007	1.007	.7	-.337	.714	-28.6
Bachelor's or Higher	.068	1.070	7.0	-.041	.960	-4.0	-.417	.659	-34.1
Female Child	-.025	.975	-2.5	-.084*	.920	-8.0	-.110	.896	-10.4
Child's Age	.007	1.008	0.8	.013*	1.013	1.3	.030*	1.031	3.1

LR chi^2 = 8349.71 Prob > chi^2 = 0.0000 Pseudo R^2 = .2339 # of Obs. = 15861

"Latino White" is comparison category; *Significant at the p<.05 level or lower

The age of the Latino parent does not significantly affect the identification of the child nor does the educational attainment of the Latino parent, but the race of the Latino parent most certainly does. Having a Latino non-white parent, whether black, American Indian or Alaskan Native, or some other race compared to having a Latino white greatly increases the odds of the child being identified as Latino other in contrast to being identified as Latino white. The same goes for the child being identified as non-Latino other in contrast to being identified as Latino white. In predicting the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino white in contrast to being identified as Latino white, only having a black or some other race parent compared to having a white parent is significantly related to the outcome, both increasing the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino white in contrast to being identified as Latino white.

This single-level analysis does not answer the question of how context affects the identification of children in multiracial/ethnic families. In order to address this question, a multilevel analysis is needed. Using HLM 6.08, I performed a multilevel binomial logistic regression. The results are displayed in Table 11. The intended goal for using this method is to measure the effect that the percent Latino in the Metropolitan Statistical Area where the family lives has on the odds of the child being identified as Latino as opposed to non-Latino. This outcome is different from the outcome in the previous analysis, in that the outcome is dichotomous - the child is either Latino or non-Latino. The reason for using a dichotomous dependent variable is so the results can be readily understood. The analysis will still capture the effect that context has on the dependent variable. In the previous chapter I provided the results of an ANOVA test, which

showed that 1.48 percent of the variance in the dependent variable occurs between MSAs rather than within. The significance of this value justifies the need for this multilevel analysis.

Referring once again to the percent change in the odds, the first thing to note is that the ethnic composition of the MSA does indeed have a significant effect on the ethnic identification of the child. An increase in the percentage of Latinos in the MSA results in a 0.8 percent decrease in the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino as compared to being identified as Latino. Though this effect is small, it is still statistically significant. Based on the ANOVA results, a large effect was not expected. The remainder of the results reflects what was found in the single level analysis. Having a Latino father decreases the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino by 14.9 percent. While having a Puerto Rican parent did not produce significant results in comparison to having a Mexican parent, having a Cuban, Salvadoran or Dominican parent did. For those who have a Cuban parent in comparison to a Mexican parent, the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino rather than Latino are increased by 61.9 percent. For those who have a Salvadoran parent, the odds of being identified as non-Latino are increased by 67 percent, and for those who have a Dominican parent, the odds are increased by 49.5 percent.

Table 11. Multilevel Binomial Results for Child Ethnicity, Latino Parents

	b	Exp(b)	%
Intercept, γ_{00}	-.729*	.482	51.8
Percent Latino, γ_{01}	-.008*	.992	-0.8
Latino Father			
Percent Latino, γ_{10}	-.161*	.851	-14.9
Ethnic Origin			
Mexican	---	---	---
Puerto Rican			
Percent Latino, γ_{20}	.084	1.088	8.8
Cuban			
Percent Latino, γ_{30}	.482*	1.619	61.9
Salvadoran			
Percent Latino, γ_{40}	.513*	1.670	67.0
Dominican			
Percent Latino, γ_{50}	.402*	1.495	49.5
Spanish in the Home			
Percent Latino, γ_{60}	-.428*	.652	-34.8
Foreign-born			
Percent Latino, γ_{70}	.204*	1.226	22.6
Age			
Less than 25	---	---	---
25 to 34			
Percent Latino, γ_{80}	.151	1.163	16.3
35 and Up			
Percent Latino, γ_{90}	.180	1.197	19.7
Race			
White	--	---	---
Black			
Percent Latino, γ_{100}	-.032	.969	-3.1
AI/AN			
Percent Latino, γ_{110}	-.572*	.564	-43.6
Other			
Percent Latino, γ_{120}	-.360*	.698	-30.2
Education			
No Diploma	---	---	---
High School Diploma			
Percent Latino, γ_{130}	-.077	.926	-7.4
Some College			
Percent Latino, γ_{140}	-.051	.950	-5.0
Bachelor's or Higher			
Percent Latino, γ_{150}	-.098	.907	-9.3
Female Child			
Percent Latino, γ_{160}	-.085*	.919	-8.1
Child's Age			
Percent Latino, γ_{170}	.011*	1.011	1.1
τ_{00} = .0776	Chi^2 = 495.3	Prob>chi^2 = 0.000	

*Significant at the p<.05 level or lower

The language spoken in the home by the Latino parent and the birthplace of the parent are once again significant related to the dependent variable. If the Latino parent speaks Spanish in the home, the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino are decreased by 34.8 percent. If the Latino parent is foreign-born, the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino are increased by 22.6 percent. In terms of the parent's race, having a Latino black parent in comparison to a Latino white parent does not produce any significant results, but having a Latino American Indian or Alaskan Native parent in comparison to a Latino white parent decreases the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino by 43.6 percent. Having a Latino other parent in comparison to a Latino white parent decrease the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino by 30.2 percent. The Latino parent's age and education were not significant related to the dependent variable, though once again the child's age and sex were. If the child is a female, the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino are decreased by 8.1 percent, and the odds are increased by 1.1 percent with each unit increase in the child's age.

Tables 10 and 11 reveal interesting relationships between parental characteristics and the identification of their multiracial/ethnic children. Clearly the ethnicity and race of the parents are consistently important predictors of the racial identity of the child when comparing the likelihood of the child being as non-Latino white to being identified as Latino white. As expected, the language that the Latino parent speaks in the home and the birthplace of the Latino parent were also important determining factors in how the children in these families are identified. More importantly though, the ethnic composition of the neighborhood proved to play an influential role in how parents

choose to identify their children. The sex of the child also proved to be important, with females more likely to be identified as Latino than males. Next I will present the analyses and interpretations for Model 2.

Model 2

The analyses in Model 2 are designed to predict the outcome of how children are ethnically identified using the characteristics of the non-Latino white parent as predictors. Like the first model, this model implements both a multinomial logistic regression analysis and a multilevel binomial logistic regression analysis. The concept is similar, in that the multinomial analysis will predict the polytomous outcome of the dependent variable and the multilevel binomial analysis will predict the dichotomous outcome of the dependent variable, with the child either being identified as Latino or non-Latino. The predictors in this model are slightly different from those in Model 1 due to the fact that in this model I examine the characteristics of the non-Latino parent. Thus I look only at the non-Latino white parent's sex, age and education as well as the age and sex of the child. In Table 12 I present the multinomial logistic regression results.

Table 12. Multinomial Results for Child Ethnicity, White Parents

Outcome:	Latino Other			Non-Latino White			Non-Latino Other		
	b	Exp(b)	%	b	Exp(b)	%	b	Exp(b)	%
White Mother	.073	1.076	7.6	-.082*	.922	-7.8	-.048	.953	-4.7
Age									
Less than 25	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
25 to 34	-.081	.922	-7.8	.428*	1.535	53.5	.355	1.426	42.6
35 and Up	-.278*	.758	-24.2	.533*	1.704	70.4	-.086	.917	-8.3
Education									
No Diploma	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
High School Diploma	.026	1.026	2.6	-.076	.927	-7.3	.001	1.001	0.1
Some College	-.030	.971	-2.9	-.058	.943	-5.7	-.240	.787	-21.3
Bachelor's or Higher	-.343*	.709	-29.1	-.217*	.805	-19.5	-.507	.602	-39.8
Female Child	.007	1.007	0.7	-.076*	.927	-7.3	-.078	.925	-7.5
Child's Age	.014*	1.014	1.4	.006	1.006	0.6	.046*	1.047	4.7
LR chi^2 = 207.03	Prob > chi^2 = 0.0000			Pseudo R^2 = .0058			# of Obs. = 15861		

"Latino White" is comparison category; *Significant at the p<.05 level or lower

Referring once again to the percent change in the odds, having a non-Latino white mother decreases the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino white in contrast to being identified as Latino white by 7.8 percent. This negative relationship is due to the fact that if the mother is non-Latino, the father is Latino. As we saw in Model 1, having a Latino father also decreases the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino white. This relationship was not significant in comparing the likelihood of the child being identified as Latino other or non-Latino other in contrast to being identified as Latino white. The non-Latino white parent's age was not a significantly related to the outcome of the child being identified as non-Latino other in contrast to being identified as Latino white, but it is influential in determining whether the child is identified as Latino other or non-Latino white. If the non-Latino white parent is 35 or older compared to 25 or less , the odds of the child being identified as Latino other in contrast to Latino white are decreased 24.2 percent. If the parent is of or between the ages of 25 to 34 compared to 25 or less, the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino white in contrast to Latino white are increased by 53.5 percent, and they are increased by 70.4 percent if the non-Latino white parent is 35 or older.

Unlike in the educational attainment of the Latino parent, the educational attainment of the non-Latino parent is also partially influential in determining the identification of the child. If the non-Latino white parent has received a bachelor's degree or higher, the odds of the child being identified as Latino other in contrast to Latino white are decreased by 29.1 percent, and the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino white in contrast to Latino white are decreased by 19.5 percent. Education is

not significantly related to the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino other. The child's sex was only significantly related to the likelihood of the child being identified as non-Latino white in contrast to Latino white, with female children being 7.3 percent less likely than male children to be identified as non-Latino white. With each increase in the child's age, the odds of the child being identified as Latino other in contrast to Latino white are increased by 1.4 percent and the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino other are increased by 4.7 percent. Next I move on to the multilevel binomial logistic regression analysis, displayed in Table 13.

The results for the multilevel analysis in this model simply reiterate what was found in Model 1 in terms of the effect of ethnic composition. Again we see that as the percent Latino in the MSA increases, the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino decreases by 0.8 percent. The characteristics of the non-Latino white parent exhibit similar relationships to the dependent variable as they did in the single level analysis. Having a white mother decreases the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino by 11.8 percent. The age of the non-Latino white parent is also a significantly related to the dependent variable. If the parent is of or between the ages of 25 to 34 compared to being 25 or less, the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino are increased by 61.6 percent. If the parent is 35 or older compared to being 25 or less, the odds of the child being identified as non-Latino are increased by 82.8 percent. The education of the non-Latino white parent is significantly related to the child's ethnic identification. Once again, the sex of the child is significant, with females 8.3 percent less likely to be identified as non-Latino.

Table 13. Multilevel Binomial Results for Child Ethnicity, White Parents

	b	Exp(b)	%
Intercept, γ_{00}	-.716*	.489	107.2
Percent Latino, γ_{01}	-.008*	.992	-0.8
White Mother			
Percent Latino, γ_{10}	-.126*	.882	-11.8
Age			
Less than 25	---	---	---
25 to 34			
Percent Latino, γ_{20}	.480*	1.616	61.6
35 and Up			
Percent Latino, γ_{30}	.603*	1.828	82.8
Education			
No Diploma	---	---	---
High School Diploma			
Percent Latino, γ_{40}	-.053	.948	-5.2
Some College			
Percent Latino, γ_{50}	-.018	.982	-1.8
Bachelor's or Higher			
Percent Latino, γ_{60}	-.107	.899	-10.1
Female Child			
Percent Latino, γ_{70}	-.086*	.917	-8.3
Child's Age			
Percent Latino, γ_{80}	.005	1.005	0.5
τ_{00} = .0745	Chi^2 = 489.3	Prob>chi^2 = 0.000	

*Significant at the p<.05 level or lower

Summary

The analyses in these studies reveal interesting results which will be discussed in further detail in the next chapter. To briefly summarize, the influence of the Latino parent on how the child is racially and ethnically identified is apparent in these models. Specifically, having a Latino father, a Latino parent who speaks Spanish at home, and a native-born Latino parent all increase the likelihood of the child being identified as Latino. Differences were also made apparent between the ethnic origin of the Latino

parent. Puerto Rican, Cuban, Salvadoran, and Dominican parents were all more likely to have their child identified as non-Latino white in comparison to Mexican parents.

One last important finding is that context does matter. The ethnic composition of the MSA in which the family lives is an important factor in how multiracial/ethnic children are identified. As the percentage Latino in the MSA increases, the likelihood of the child being identified as Latino also increases. While this effect was relatively small, it still proved to be important in accounting for how families racially and ethnically identify their children in conjunction with household dynamics, which primarily consist of the way in which the Latino parent has influence over the identification of the child.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Findings

In this chapter I will begin by discussing the five hypotheses and whether or not they are each supported by the previous analyses. The first hypothesis regarding the parent's race/ethnicity and gender is generally supported by the findings. Overall, having a Latino father increases the likelihood that the child will also be identified as Latino. The presence of a Latino father especially increases the likelihood of the child being identified as Latino white rather than non-Latino white. Given that children who are identified as Latino white and non-Latino white were the two largest groups in the sample and yet so different from one another, this is where having a Latino father was expected to have the most impact. Conversely, it is interesting to note that while having a Latino father increases the likelihood of the child being identified as Latino, having a Latina mother increases the likelihood of the child being identified as non-Latino. Thus, it would appear from these findings that children are consistently more likely to be racially and ethnically identified with their father. A further exploration into this relationship is necessary in order to fully understand what is happening here.

My second hypothesis is also partially supported by the findings. While the birthplace of the Latino parent was not able to predict the likelihood of the child being given a non-white racial identity, it was able to tell us that children whose Latino parent is U.S.- born rather than foreign-born are more likely to be identified as Latino white

rather than non-Latino white. This finding was consistent in both the single level analysis and the multilevel analysis.

Overall, the third hypothesis was not supported by the analyses. The educational attainment of the Latino parent did not significantly affect the racial and ethnic identification of the child. It was able to predict the child's identification in preliminary analyses, but once the Latino parent's race and ethnicity variables were incorporated into the model, educational attainment was rendered insignificant. Interestingly, however, the non-Latino white parent's educational attainment does appear to play a part in how children are identified. In Model 2 it was found that children are more likely to have a Latino white identity rather than a non-Latino white identity if the non-Latino white parent has a college degree or higher.

My fourth hypothesis was supported by the findings in Model 1. Having a Latino parent who speaks a language other than English in the home appears to be influential in how the family chooses the ethnic and racial identification of their child. If the Latino parent is speaking a language other than English at home, particularly if that language is Spanish, it serves as an indicator that the child is likely to be identified as Latino rather than non-Latino white. Once again, however, language was only important when comparing the likelihood of the child being identified as non-Latino white to the child being identified as Latino white.

The fifth hypothesis regarding the influence of the ethnic composition of the area in which the family lives was also supported by the findings. The multilevel analyses revealed that as the percent Latino increases in the Metropolitan Statistical Area where

the family lives, the likelihood of the child being identified as Latino increases. The relationship was slight, perhaps due to the fact that an MSA is encompasses more than just the immediate area surrounding the family's residence, but the relationship is still important and supportive of the idea that minority presence in the area where a multiracial/ethnic family lives leads to a stronger likelihood that the children will be given a non-white identity.

There were a few other interesting findings which resulted from this study. The most important of these is the difference in the identification of the child by the ethnic origin of the Latino parent. In the multinomial logistic results of Model 1, it was very apparent that some Latino ethnic origin groups are more inclined towards a non-Latino identity for their child than others. Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Dominicans, and Salvadorans were all significantly more likely to identify their multiracial/ethnic child as non-Latino white in comparison to Mexican parents. The implications of this will be discussed in the next section.

Another interesting finding is with regards to the sex of the child. Consistently throughout the analyses, female children were more likely to be identified as Latinas than the male children were. Findings in previous literature have discussed the sex of the child in relation to the sex of the minority parent in determining the identification of the child. However, the outcome of these analyses was not how the child is identified in relation to their parents, but rather just if the child is identified as Latino or not. Yet still it would appear that the sex of the child is somehow an important factor in how the child is identified. This finding will also be discussed in the following section.

Implications

This study has if nothing else reaffirmed what is already known about racial and ethnic identification – it is situational and socially constructed. One thing that stood out from the findings is that the influence of the father in the family is still a crucial component in decision making, particularly when it comes to making a decision on how to racially and ethnically identify the family's multiracial/ethnic child. However, it is not just the ethnicity of the Latino father which plays an influential role in how the family handles identity for clearly language is also important. While it can be said that speaking Spanish in the home is more likely to lead to a Latino identification for the child, it can also be said that families who encourage speaking Spanish in the home are also families who embrace Latino heritage and culture and were already resolved to identify their children as Latino. From this a further exploration is needed in order to assess how Latino parents in multiracial/ethnic households encourage culture and tradition, not only with their children but also with their spouses.

The idea that context matters (Holloway et al. 2009) is something which to an extent was also found here. While Holloway et al. (2009) were able to get down to the neighborhood level using confidential data, I was able to somewhat reaffirm their findings that although context is not the most influential factor in influencing how children in multiracial/ethnic families are identified, it does matter and should not be overlooked when studying how multiracial/ethnic families approach the complicated issue of identification for their children. Despite the relatively small effect that ethnic composition has on the ethnic identification of the child, it is still one of the more

important findings in this study. Knowing that context and surroundings can influence racial/ethnic identification tells us much about how when given a choice on how to identify oneself or one's children, several factors can come into play including the people around you. When Latino/non-Latino white families live in areas with high percentages of Latinos, it undoubtedly leads to a greater likelihood that the children of these families will be identified as at least partially Latino. This relationship could work both ways though. It is possible that multiracial/ethnic families are more inclined to live in more diverse areas, thus they already intended to identify their children as at least partially Latino before choosing to live in a diverse area.

Referring back to Bonilla-Silva (2004), it is possible that one reason why the contextual predictor was not able to account for much variation in ethnic identification is because Latinos vary greatly on several different aspects. Latinos are not a homogenous group by any means and they experience society in a variety of ways depending on skin color, nativity, education, and other important characteristics which can influence who an individual interacts with and how they choose or are able to portray themselves. For instance, it is probably much more difficult for Latino blacks to get away from an ethnic identification and they are also probably more like to interact with other minorities. However, the racial identification of the Latino parent was accounted for the in the multilevel analysis in Model 1, and we still see the effect of ethnic composition.

In terms of nativity, the findings of Qian (2004) are reaffirmed in this study. Native-born Latino parents are more likely than foreign-born Latino parents to have their children identified as Latino. In this regard I agree with the speculations of the previous

study that native-born Latinos are more aware of the concept of racial and ethnic identity in the United States, having experienced it their entire lives. In contrast, foreign-born Latinos may not hold the same ideas about racial and ethnic identification given that they come from different nations, though this largely depends on how long the parent has lived in the United States.

A finding which warrants further discussion here is the distinct differences between the Latino ethnic origin groups in how their children were identified. Model 1 resulted in significant variation between the groups, with Puerto Rican, Cuban, Salvadoran and Dominican parents all more likely to identify their child as non-Latino white in comparison to Mexican parents. One possibility as to why this is so is that the Mexican parent group in this sample has a higher proportion of native-borns compared to the other groups. Based on the findings that native-born Latino parents are more likely than foreign-born Latino parents to assign a Latino identity to their child, this could perhaps be why Mexican parents are in turn more likely to have children identified as Latinos, while the other groups are more inclined to give their children a non-Latino white identity. However, this is only speculation and further investigation would be needed to answer the reason as to why the analysis resulted in this finding.

Another interesting finding that came out of this study is the difference in the sex of the child. Overall the female children are less likely than the male children to be identified as non-Latino white in contrast to being identified as Latino white. Had the outcome been the way in which children are identified in relation to their parents, this difference would not have been surprising because children are expected to be identified

with their same-sex parent. However, there have been previous studies which do suggest that what was found in this study might have an explanation. As stated in Chapter II, both Harris (2002) and Brunsma (2005) found that females are more likely to be identified as multiracial/ethnic. Harris (2002) could not provide a clear explanation as to why females are overrepresented in the multiracial/ethnic population, though it is suggested that we must look at the way in which boys and girls are socialized differently.

Apart from confirming previous findings, this study also makes a unique contribution the sociological literature by examining a specific group of multiracial/ethnic families and how their distinct qualities influence the identification of their children. By looking at Latino/non-Latino white families, I was able to assess how culture and differences in ethnic origin groups are important factors in how these families approach the concept of racial and ethnic identification. Along with this, very few studies have examined the way in which context affects racial and ethnic identity at the individual level by using multilevel analyses. It is my hope that this study will encourage more studies in the future to focus on Latino multiracial/ethnic groups, especially given the increasing importance of the Latino population in the United States.

Limitations

Although I believe this study has in many ways made a contribution to the multiracial/ethnic family literature, especially with regards to looking at context and how Latino parents influence the way in which their children are identified, there were several limitations which in some ways hindered the extent to which implications can be

taken away from it. The first limitation is that the data utilized was census data, which surveys households and typically involves one individual in the household completing the questionnaire. Therefore, the data is largely dependent on who fills out the questionnaire, and unfortunately there is no way of knowing who that person was. Some assumptions can be made from the data, for instance it is possible and perhaps quite likely that the first person listed in the household was the person who filled out the questionnaire. But without any sure way of knowing, we cannot rely on this assumption. Thus I was not able to measure how the person who fills out the questionnaire affects the data and ultimately the analysis. Another setback due to the data is that I could not in any way examine the child's preference for identification. There are other datasets available which provide this information, but the American Community Survey dataset is not one of them. However, the American Community Survey does provide important and useful data which helped to test the hypotheses in this study.

Another limitation of this study is that the analyses performed can be considered a bit simplistic in comparison to what could have been done. For instance, more variables which better measure socioeconomic status could have been included, and perhaps doing this could have told us a different story in terms of how socioeconomic status affects the identification of the child. Also, more independent variables concerning nativity could have been included, specifically variables which measure the amount of time that foreign-born parents have spent in the United States. Knowing how long the foreign-born parent has been in the United States could have allowed for more investigation into the finding that foreign-born Latino parents are more likely to identify

their children as non-Latino white. The analyses were also limited by data complications, in that Latino identity is considered to be an ethnic identity rather than a racial identity. Having to work around this problem in many ways hindered the implications that I was able to make from the models.

Another setback of this study is that it used cross-sectional data. Racial and ethnic identification is fluid across time and space, and given that I was also including context as a predictor, it would have perhaps been helpful towards drawing conclusions if I could have taken into consideration how families evolve over time and how changing spaces can cause families to rethink how they identify themselves. In this study, I looked only at where families were living at the time of the survey without taking into consideration how long they had lived there. As I suggested previously, it could be the case that parents were identifying their children as Latino or partially Latino before even moving to a more diverse area.

Referring again to the multilevel analysis, I was only able to assess contextual effects at the Metropolitan Statistical Area, which is a rather large geographic area and does not really tell us much about the particular surroundings of the family. In order to really talk about how context matters, it is necessary to get down to a smaller level that better reflects neighborhood characteristics. Within a MSA, there are several neighborhoods and they vary greatly by racial and ethnic composition and socioeconomic status. Thus, while the ethnic composition of the MSA proved to be a significant predictor, we cannot draw too many implications from this finding because it is far from specific.

Future Research

There are a few areas in which I would like to expand upon in the future. The first is the apparent differences in how parents from different Latino ethnic origin groups choose to identify their multiracial/ethnic children. This study did not to go any great lengths in examining different dynamics between the Latino ethnic origin groups, and thus at this point a number of possible explanations could be behind the finding that Latino parents approach multiracial/ethnic identity for their children different depending on what specific Latino group they belong to. In the future, I would like to examine a larger sample of Latino multiracial/ethnic families and further investigate ways in which different Latino groups experience racial and ethnic identity in the United States.

In the future I would also like to examine the self-identification of multiracial/ethnic children. Many studies referenced in the literature review also looked at how children identify themselves. In several ways self-identification in comparison to how parents identify their children can tell us more about family dynamics and how the parents can affect the ways in which the children themselves handle their multiracial/ethnic identity. For instance, while the language spoken in the home by the Latino parent was an important factor in this study, it is possible that when looking at how children identify themselves the language spoken in the home and other cultural influences could be very strong factors.

As far as looking at how context matters, in the future I would like to utilize smaller geographic areas in order to assess the influence of the family's immediate surroundings, including their neighbors and other people who they are more likely to

interact with. This could once again also be useful for looking at the child's self-identification, since children are often influenced by their peers as well as their parents. To add to this, it would also be important to account for how long the family has lived in the area in order to address the question as to whether families are influenced by their neighborhood or families select neighborhoods which are better aligned with their interests in terms of how much diversity they look for.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Margo J. 2002. "Counting by Race: The Antebellum Legacy." Pp. 269-87 in *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*, edited by Joel Perlmann and Mary C. Waters. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2004. "From Bi-racial to Tri-racial: Towards a New System of Racial Stratification in the USA." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 27: 931-50.

Bradshaw, Carla K. 1992. "Beauty and the Beast: On Racial Ambiguity" Pp. 77-88 in *Racially Mixed People in America*, edited by Maria P. P. Root. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Bratter, Jenifer. 2000. "A Matter of Place, Region, and Race: A Spatial Discussion of Black-White Intermarriage in 1990." *Sociological Imagination* 37: 283-305.

Bratter, Jenifer and Holly E. Heard. 2009. "Mother's, Father's, or Both? Parental Gender and Parent-Child Interactions in the Racial Classification of Adolescents." *Sociological Forum* 24: 658-88.

Brunsma, David L. 2005. "Interracial Families and the Racial Identification of Mixed-Race Children: Evidence from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study." *Social Forces* 84: 1131-56.

Campbell, Mary E. 2006. "Thinking Outside the (Black) Box: Measuring Black and Multiracial Identification on Surveys." *Social Science Research* 36: 921-44.

Del Rio, Maria M. 1999. "The Role of Connection to the Native Culture in Intercultural Marriages: Perceptions of Puerto Rican Women." *Dissertation Abstracts International* 59: 3768.

Denton, Nancy A. and Douglas S. Massey. 1989. "Racial Identity Among Caribbean Hispanics: The Effect of Double Minority Status on Residential Segregation." *American Sociological Review* 54: 790-808.

Edmonston, Barry, Sharon M. Lee, and Jeffrey S. Passel. 2002. "Recent Trends in Intermarriage and Immigration and Their Effects on the Future Racial Composition of the U.S. Population." Pp. 227-55 in *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*, edited by Joel Perlmann and Mary C. Waters. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Farley, Reynolds. 2002. "Racial Identities in 2000: The Response to the Multiple-Race Response Option." Pp. 33-61 in *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*, edited by Joel Perlmann and Mary C. Waters. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Feagin, Joe R. and Clairece Booher Feagin. 2003. *Racial and Ethnic Relations*. 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gans, Herbert J. 1979. "Symbolic Ethnicity: The Future of Ethnic Groups and Cultures in America." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2: 1-20.

Glazer, Nathan. 2002. "Reflections on Race, Hispanicity, and Ancestry in the U.S. Census." Pp. 318-26 in *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*, edited by Joel Perlmann and Mary C. Waters. New York: Russell Sage Foundation

Goldstein, Joshua R. and Ann J. Morning. 2002. "Back in the Box: The Dilemma of Using Multiple-Race Data for Single-Race Laws." Pp. 119-36 in *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*, edited by Joel Perlmann and Mary C. Waters. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

González, Andrea G., Adriana J. Umaña-Taylor, and Mayra Y. Bámaca. 2006. "Familial Ethnic Socialization Among Adolescents of Latino and European Descent: Do Latina Mothers Exert the Most Influence?" *Journal of Family Issues* 27: 184-207.

Gordon, Milton. 1964. *Assimilation in American Life: The Role of Race, Religion and National Origins*. New York: Oxford Press.

Grieco, Elizabeth M. and Rachel C. Cassidy. 2001. "Overview of Race and Hispanic Origin: Census 2000 Brief." *U.S. Bureau of the Census*.

Gurak, Douglas T. and Joseph P. Fitzpatrick. 1982. "Intermarriage among Hispanic Ethnic Groups in New York City." *American Journal of Sociology* 87: 921-34.

Guzman, Betsy. 2001. "The Hispanic Population: Census 2000 Brief." *U.S. Bureau of the Census.*

Harris, David R. 2002. "Does it Matter How We Measure? Racial Classification and the Characteristics of Multiracial Youth." Pp. 62-101 in *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*, edited by Joel Perlmann and Mary C. Waters. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Harris, Kathleen M., Frank F. Frustenberg, Jr., and Jeremy Marmer. 1998. "Parental Involvement with Adolescents in Intact Families: The Influence of Fathers Over the Life Course." *Demography* 35: 201-16.

Hochschild, Jennifer L. 2002. "Multiple Racial Identifiers in the 2000 Census, and Then What?" Pp. 340-53 in *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*, edited by Joel Perlmann and Mary C. Waters. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Hollinger, David A. 2006. "Race, Politics, and the Census." *Chronicle of Higher Education* 52: B6-B8.

Holloway, Steven R., Richard Wright, Mark Ellis and Margaret East. 2009. "Place, Scale and the Racial Claims Made for Multiracial Children in the 1990 US Census." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32: 522-47.

Jacobson, Matthew Frye. 2002. "History, Historicity, and the Census Count by Race." Pp. 259-62 in *The New Race Question: How the Census Counts Multiracial Individuals*, edited by Joel Perlmann and Mary C. Waters. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kalmijn, Matthijs. 1998. "Intermarriage and Homogamy: Causes, Patterns, Trends." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 395-421.

Lee, Jennifer and Frank D. Bean. 2004. "America's Changing Color Lines: Immigration, Race/Ethnicity, and Multiracial Identification." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 221-42.

——— 2007. "Reinventing the Color Line: Immigration and America's New Racial/Ethnic Divide." *Social Forces* 86: 561-86.

Lee, Sharon M. and Barry Edmonston. 2006. "Hispanic Intermarriage, Identification, and U.S. Latino Population Change." *Social Science Quarterly* 87: 1263-79.

Lichter, Daniel T., J. Brian Brown, Zhenchao Qian, and Julie H. Carmalt. 2007. "Marital Assimilation Among Hispanics: Evidence of Declining Cultural and Economic Incorporation?" *Social Science Quarterly* 88: 745-65.

Massey, Douglas S. and Nancy A. Denton. 1992. "Racial Identity and the Spatial Assimilation of Mexicans in the United States." *Social Science Research* 21: 235-60.

McKinney, Cliff and Kimberley Renk. 2008. "Differential Parenting Between Mothers and Fathers." *Journal of Family Issues* 29: 806-27.

Miller, Robin L. 1992. "The Human Ecology of Multiracial Identity." Pp. 24-36 in *Racially Mixed People in America*, edited by Maria P. P. Root. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Nagel, Joane. 1994. "Constructing Ethnicity: Creating and Recreating Ethnic Identity and Culture." *Social Problems* 41: 152-76.

Nobles, Melissa. 2000. *Shades of Citizenship: Race and the Census in Modern Politics*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Executive Office of the President. 1994. "Standard for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity." *Federal Register* 59: 29831-5.

——— 1997. "Revisions to the Standards for the Classification of Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity." *Federal Register* 62: 58782-90.

Portes, Alejandro. 1984. "The Rise of Ethnicity: Determinants of Ethnic Perceptions Among Cuban Exiles in Miami." *American Sociological Review* 49: 383-97.

Qian, Zhenchao. 2004. "Options: Racial/Ethnic Identification of Children of Intermarried Couples." *Social Science Quarterly* 85: 746-66.

Raudenbush, Stephen W. and Anthony S. Burk. 2002. *Hierarchical Linear Models: Applications and Data Analysis Methods*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Saenz, Rogelio. 2004. "Latinos and the Changing Face of America." *The American People Census 2000*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Saenz, Rogelio, Sean-Shong Hwang, Benigno E. Aguirre, and Robert N. Anderson. 1995. "Persistence and Change in Asian Identity Among Children of Intermarried Couples." *Sociological Perspectives* 38: 175-94.

Shih, Margaret and Diana T. Sanchez. 2009. "When Race Becomes Even More Complex: Toward Understanding the Landscape of Multiracial Identity and Experiences." *Journal of Social Issues* 65: 1-11.

Smith, James P. and Barry Edmonston. 1997. *The New Americans: Economic, Demographic, and Fiscal Effects of Immigration*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Spickard, Paul R. 1992. "The Illogic of American Racial Categories." Pp. 12-23 in *Racially Mixed People in America*, edited by Maria P. P. Root. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Starrels, Marjorie E. 1994. "Gender Differences in Parent-Child Relations." *Journal of Family Issues* 15: 148-65.

Telles, Edward E. and Vilma Ortiz. 2008. *Generations of Exclusion: Mexican Americans, Assimilation, and Race*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Thornton, Michael C. 1992. "The Quiet Immigration: Foreign Spouses of U.S. Citizens, 1945-1985." Pp. 64-76 in *Racially Mixed People in America*, edited by Maria P. P. Root. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Umaña-Taylor, Adriana J. and Mark A. Fine. 2001. "Methodological Implications of Grouping Latino Adolescents into One Collective Ethnic Group." *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 23: 347-62.

Wadlington, Walter. 1966. "The Loving Case: Virginia's Anti-Miscegenation Statute in Historical Perspective." *Virginia Law Review* 52: 1189-1223.

Waters, Mary C. 1990. *Ethnic Options: Choosing Identities in America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Weisman, Evelyn Marino. 2001. "Bicultural Identity and Language Attitudes: Perspectives of Four Latina Teachers." *Urban Education* 36: 203-25.

Xie, Yu and Kimberly Goyette. 1997. "The Racial Identification of Biracial Children with One Asian Parent: Evidence from the 1990 Census." *Social Forces* 76: 547-70.

Yueng, W. Jean, John F. Sandberg, Pamela E. Davis-Kean, and Sandra L. Hofferth. 2001. "Children's Time with Fathers in Intact Families." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 63: 136-54.

VITA

Name:	Amber Raquel Fox
Address:	C/O: Department of Sociology 311 Academic Building College Station, TX 77840-4351
Email Address:	amos@tamu.edu
Education:	B.A., Sociology, Texas A&M University – Commerce, 2008 M.S., Sociology, Texas A&M University, 2010